The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1899.

The Week.

The latest news about Samoan affairs is supplied by Herr von Bülow's speech in the Reichstag, a statement of singular lucidity and frankness, couched in terms of equal courtesy and self-respect. With such a spirit prevailing in Berlin there can be no fear of any serious trouble growing out of the killing of the American and British soldiers by the Mataafaites the other day, or out of the complication as a whole. The negotiation on our side has been conducted with the evident desire to yield all the points in a game which is not worth the candle; and this is the right way to conduct it. It does not imply "lowering the flag" or sacrificing the national honor, but merely a wholesome desire to get rid of a bad job on the best terms and at the least cost possible. The Cologne *Gazette* gives us unstinted praise for the concessions we have made and the friendship we have shown to Germany, in such sad contrast to the exacting and bickering policy of Great Britain. This means that we have found out the mistake we made in meddling with the Samoan business at all. It means, also, that the less we have to do with it hereafter, the better we shall be pleased. It is not possible to interpret in any other way the announcement which comes from Washington, and is confirmed from Berlin, that when Germany proposed that the Samoan Commission of three should act only by unanimous consent we agreed, and that when Great Britain declined the proposal, thus causing a deadlock, we withdrew from active participation in the controversy, leaving the other parties to fight it out. This was what Burke called a case of wholesome neglect. It had the effect of bringing the others to an agreement which promises to be satisfactory. For this Secretary Hay is to be congratulated. If he could attenuate our share in the Samoan muddle still more, he might spare us further trouble and save some American lives.

Considering what the United States and England and Germany undertook to do in the Samoan Islands, what they actually have done looks like a sarcastic comment by fate on human intentions. By the act, or treaty, of Berlin, concluded on June 14, 1889, the three Powers graciously proposed to show the Samoans how to do it. They were to put an end to the bloody conflicts between rival chiefs, known as "kings." They were to take charge of trade and land titles and education and religion, and in general make the islands blossom at once into civilization. During the ten years of this kindly tripartite tutelage, however, we have seen two wars conducted in the characteristic way of savages; we have seen endless intrigues and squabbles, principally between the representatives of the three governments who were to teach the natives how to dwell together in unity; and, as the final touch, we see the lives of English and American officers and men lost in the attempt to settle the quarrels of barbarians on the other side of the globe. Surely it was a prophetic word which that sane and cool American, Secretary Gresham, wrote in 1894:

> "In our relations to Samoa we have made the first departure from our traditional and well-established policy of avoiding entangling alliances with foreign Powers in relation to objects remote from this hemisphere. Like all other human transactions, the wisdom of that departure must be tested by its fruits. . . . Every nation, and especially every strong nation, must sometimes be conscious of an impulse to rush into difficulties that do not concern it except in a highly imaginary way. . . . But our first adventure in that direction afforded most signal and convincing proof that the only safeguard against *all* the evils of interference in affairs that do not specially concern us, is to abstain from such interference altogether. . . . The general act of Berlin has utterly failed to correct, if indeed it has not aggravated, the very evils which it was designed to prevent."

If Mr. Gresham could say this in 1894, what would he say now if he were alive and saw, not only the natives in Samoa butchering each other, but the foreign forces there almost at blows? The way in which all ideas of justice and decency are necessarily mixed up in such a business is shown in the dispatches. A landing party kills twenty-seven natives with machine-guns, with no loss of its own. That is quite right. That is the way civilized men fight and teach savages to be good. But the next day the savages ambush the foreigners, whose machine-gun gets unluckily "jammed," kill half-a-dozen men, and cut off their heads. Thereupon the civilized and Christian world explodes with cries of "Butchery!" Why won't the brown man take his killing by the white man in peace? He will have to be killed some more till he learns this first lesson. Meanwhile, we observe that the angry Germans in Samoa are sneering at the Christianity of the English and Americans, and that Admiral Kautz returns the compliment with fine scorn for German Christianity. One would like to know what the natives could do, if they had a chance, in taunting the religion of their foreign slayers.

The following luminous dispatch was sent on Monday to a Detroit newspaper by Mr. Carmichael, a personal friend of Mr. Alger's:

> "If Secretary Alger retires from the cabinet before March 4, 1901, there will be no subterfuge or makeshift about it. He will not retire to go to Paris, will not retire on account of ill health, or for personal political reasons. Should he retire, it will only be after the President makes a direct and unqualified request. The Secretary has had expressions from the President as to the desirability of his remaining in the cabinet. He does not know that the President has changed. If the President should change, he must so declare and announce himself; he must assume full responsibility. It is not a case where there can be any pretence. This is Secretary Alger's position."

This is the most direct challenge which has yet come to Mr. McKinley from Alger. He here puts the responsibility of his presence in the cabinet fairly and squarely on his revered chief. We now know that if Alger is there, McKinley alone is responsible for it. Alger is ready to go when properly requested, but he will not go under any subterfuge or disguise. No "need of rest," no "ill health," or anything of that sort. He must be asked to go by the only man who has a right to ask him. Why does not that man ask him? What is the mysterious bond which connects them? Will nobody throw light on this subject? McKinley is not firm or obstinate. He listens to the voice of the people. He consults Destiny and obeys Duty. We have never known a case in which Duty spoke more plainly and Destiny spoke more wisely. Why does he, then, linger? Why, too, this defiant tone on the part of Alger? He knows he can be dismissed to the dreary shades of Detroit in the twinkling of an eye. How comes he to be so "cocky"? Why must McKinley dismiss him squarely? Why can he not, if convenient, get rid of him on some pretext? These are all topics which we think would be excellent as an exercise for the history class at colleges.

Gen. Shafter had a regular picnic with the beef which Eagan and Alger sent him in Cuba. He ate it every day, and though it was "not entirely appetizing, there was no complaint that it was unfit for food." He is even inclined to think that the Rough Riders and others who complained of their rations were really expecting to have "delicacies" instead of bacon and hard-tack. When asked by the counsel of Gen. Miles, "In view of the condemnation of the canned roast beef by about 75 per cent. of the officers in Cuba, what would you say about its further use?" he replied: "As I have said, I don't know of anything better. Personally, I prefer clear bacon. I want to say that the canned roast beef was not unfit for food. That it was unpalatable, uninviting, and without taste, is perfectly true. But it was not unfit for food." It would be interesting to know what the General would consider "unfit for food." His noble championship of the beef shows that he is standing brave-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly by the powers that put him in charge of the Cuban expedition.

The *Tribune* has begun to give place to attacks on the Administration in the guise of Letters to the Editor, dated from the Union League Club. They receive a kind of editorial endorsement by being set in larger type than other letters to the editor, and placed at the head of a particular column. They show also similarities of style which betray a common parentage. Their temper is so different from the adulation which the *Tribune* bestowed upon President McKinley before the embassy to England was disposed of, as to suggest some connection between the two. Such is the talk, at all events, within the precincts of the club from which the letters are supposed to come. The writer of the letters is disturbed by the fear that he may have to vote for McKinley again, "as a choice of evils"—that he "may be obliged at the next election to endorse the selection of Sherman and Alger for positions in the cabinet." How dreadful that this Union Leaguer never gave utterance to such thoughts until after Joseph Choate was appointed Ambassador. If he had spoken out in time, we might have had a better cabinet and have avoided all the bitterness and bad beef that Alger and Eagan supplied to the soldiers. The way to prevent a recurrence of these evils and to spare the Union League Republican the necessity of making a choice between them and others, is for the editor of the *Tribune* to bring out a candidate in opposition to Mr. McKinley—not necessarily himself, but somebody whom he can rely on in the troublous times that we plainly see coming.

Mr. Moss succeeded very well on Saturday in showing what Croker regarded as "personal" or "private business." Everything that bears on the income which he derives from his system of government is of this nature. Did he give his son $17,000, as the boy swore he did, to invest in the stock of a fireproofing concern? He declines to answer, because that is "private business." Although he admits openly that he is the head of the government, disposes of all its offices, and attends to all the duties of its administration, when it comes to his revenues from it, those are "private business," and he will not consent to answer any questions about them. We are, therefore, no wiser on this point than we were before Mr. Moss began his inquiries. How can we get information as to the dimensions of our ruler's income? Would it not be possible to hear from the contributors of funds to his revenue? There were indications of such testimony on Saturday when the Dock Department came into view as a possible agent of oppression against an ice company, and more may be forthcoming. Croker has offered, first, to sacrifice his right hand in case he is shown to have taken city money dishonestly, and, second, to part with his fortune and liberty in case such a showing is made; but when he is given opportunity to say whether or not he has taken money dishonorably in a specific instance, he replies invariably: "I decline to answer." That shows that proof on this point must be obtained from the other side.

It is quite plain that Croker's flank movement on Platt, assailing him as a man who is in the same business as himself, and as such equally open to public investigation, has gone a long way towards nullifying the work of the Mazet committee. The vote of Monday, by which the Republican members rejected a proposal by the Democratic minority to include the Platt family law firm in the inquiry, put the partisan brand upon the investigation so clearly that its work in the future will be greatly weakened in the public estimation. So long as Croker can continue to ask Mr. Moss, whenever he is pressed as to the sources of his income, "Why don't you call Platt and ask the same questions of him?" there is small hope of awakening much public indignation against Tammany. The spectacle of one boss investigating another boss, when the public is fully aware that one is not a whit better than the other, and that the two are at odds temporarily only because of dissatisfaction over the division of the "swag," is not an impressive moral spectacle, whatever else may come of it.

A telegram from London says that a Blue Book has been published giving the evidence obtained by the Indian Currency Committee. This is the Committee which sought to meet the views and wishes of the Wolcott Commission by reopening the Indian mint to silver, and by taking a certain amount of silver into the metallic reserve of the Bank of England. The Blue Book is said to contain a letter from Secretary Hay to Lord Aldenham, a leader of the English Bimetallists, dated November 25, 1898, saying that our Government does not consider it expedient for the United States to reopen the bimetallic question at present. Lord Aldenham said that Secretary Hay's letter had been delayed, and he thought intentionally, until after the elections of last November. This shows that his Lordship is a man of discernment in the political field, if not in the economical. The McKinley Administration interpreted the elections of last autumn as putting the silver question on the shelf, and therefore had no further use for international monetary conferences. Lord Aldenham thought, however, that something might be gained by negotiating with the United States about a ratio to be adopted for reopening the Indian mint to silver. This is very likely. We can see no reason why Secretary Hay should withhold his consent from any ratio for India that the responsible authorities of that country should think it advisable to adopt.

The budget just presented by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach does not meet the approval of the most influential part of the English press, but it is likely to pass the House when the pinch comes. It shows an increase of about £2,000,000 in expenditures over last year (due to increase of the navy). There has been a progressive increase in the annual expenditure of nearly £20,000,000 in the past five years, which has been met by increased receipts, but the Chancellor faces a deficit of about £1,800,000 during the coming year. This he expects to meet by new taxes, and by such a change in the sinking-fund arrangements that the annual payment of the principal of the public debt shall be in part postponed. This is to be accomplished by extending the terminable annuities. The annual charge will thus be lessened, but the term for which they are to run will be lengthened. This is a well-known device of finance ministers, and a very easy one for dealing with a deficit. It amounts to fresh borrowing, although the fact is not so notorious as it would be if new consols were sold in the market. Sir William Harcourt, in the debate on the budget, unravelled the skein of extended annuities in a very lucid manner, and visited it with severe condemnation, and in this he seems to have the concurrence of the London *Times*, which, in nine cases out of ten, supports the Government's policy. The *Times*, however, believes that the budget, as presented, will meet with little popular opposition.

Perhaps the most hopeful augury to be drawn from the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is to be found in his remarks on the coming Peace Conference. What he said on this subject came from the heart. He bestowed unstinted eulogy upon the humane views which inspired the calling of it, and he hoped that it might put a check on the terrible competition in armaments "so wasteful to our ability, energy, and money, from which even the wealthiest nations may pray to be delivered." If the coming conference could consist of the Finance Ministers of the several countries, there could be little doubt of a triumphant success in achieving the purpose of the Czar's famous letter. The men who have to find the money for the ships and the soldiers, spend sleepless nights over their tasks, and generally end by sliding into a little more debt. There comes a time, however, when such financiering will not serve the turn. Italy has reached it. France is on the verge of it. Austria is not far behind;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia, with all her slumbering resources, is hard put to it to make ends meet. The movement for the Peace Conference had its initiative in the Russian Department of Finance. It was discernible in the published reports of that department before the Czar wrote his letter. Indeed, taxes are the most potent corrective of the tendency to war—more potent than religion or education. We shall discover the universality of this truth whenever our present surplus is exhausted, and the Secretary of the Treasury is compelled to call for additional revenue. Powder and ball and pensions for the soldiers and sailors who are butchering and being butchered in the Philippines and Samoa, are costly. Blood may be cheap, but modern ships and projectiles are terribly expensive.

The Czar's treatment of Finland has naturally enough prejudiced a good many in England against his peace proposal, but there is no sound reason why it should. He has been, in a measure, driven into it by the rage for many years back of the Panslavists, or Jingoes, the Destiny and Duty men. These worthies have long been furious that part of Russia should have a constitution and the rest should be governed despotically, and they have, like the fox, been doing everything in their power to have all tails cut off. The invectives against the Finns have increased in violence as the Panslavist feeling has grown. What we see now, outrageous as it is to us, has been long impending, and the Czar is a young and impressionable man. But there is in this nothing that makes it improper that he should try to lessen the chance of war. He is not departing from his principles of government as we are. He is simply carrying them one step further. He is doing an oppressive thing, but he is doing it for the development of Russia's greatness on the lines she has always followed. We are doing an equally oppressive thing, to people who have never lived under our rule, on absolutely new lines which we have denounced, with all the invectives at our disposal, for one hundred years. Nothing the Czar has done or proposed to do to the Finns approaches in atrocity what we are doing every day to the Filipinos. There has not been since the partition of Poland a transaction which can equal in nefariousness our pretence that we have bought the Philippines from Spain under "international law." In fact, there is nothing in Russian history, black as it is in many respects, which can equal our "conquest" as a mixture of gas and crime.

The London *Daily News* calls attention to the small amount of support given to the peace movement in England by the clergy of the Established Church, compared to that which it has received from the Nonconformists. The appearance of the Bishop of London in the deputation to Mr. Balfour may be said to constitute a brilliant exception. The attitude of the Anglican clergy towards every reform since 1815 has been open to the same criticism. The Bishops in the House of Lords opposed the abolition of the slave trade and slavery. The clergy throughout the country fought hard against the Reform Bill. They were furious haters of Mr. Gladstone and all his works. They were violent opponents of his great crusade on behalf of the Bulgarians in 1877. Needless to say, they were opposed to his Home-Rule movement, but in this they only went the way of most Englishmen. They are not now, as a rule, opposing this peace movement, but they are giving it comparatively small support.

The explanation of this lies not in any difference between the doctrines they hold and preach, and those preached or held by the Nonconformist ministers, but in two what may be called "lurking senses." One is that the Anglican church is the church of the gentry, and ought not to be mixed up in anything frowned on by good society. The parson never forgets that he dines with the Squire. The other is, that he looks on himself as to some degree a state official, who should not lightly take part in any "agitation" intended to force the hand of the Government. As clergymen rise out of the ranks, too, they remember, consciously or subconsciously, that preferment in the church is in the hands of the minister of the day, that it is he who bestows the bishoprics and deaneries, and that he has many livings at his disposal. All these things dispose an Anglican minister to keep still, not to get excited, and be "solid" with the "genteel." What this means is that his church is a state church, and that as long as it is so it can never be the church of the people. Nothing is more curious, though it has not been much remarked upon, than that all the great excitements and controversies which have raged in the Anglican church have raged among the clergy or the intellectual aristocracy of the universities. In none of the memoirs will you find that the laity have taken much part in them or interest in them. That portion of the laity which takes much interest in religion, as a rule, is Nonconformist, or, in other words, belongs to a different England. In fact, the two nations knew so little of each other that, until within a few years, an Oxford undergraduate could hardly believe that a Nonconformist minister knew how to tie his white cravat.

Full returns of the Spanish elections of Sunday are not yet forthcoming, but that the Government has won a majority in the new Cortes, is already apparent as it was the only thing to be expected. Governments in Spain always get a majority, and are later turned out of office by it. The present Prime Minister, it is true, had proclaimed a new departure. He had declared that he would exert no pressure in favor of Government candidates, and said that he should consider defeat more honorable than a triumph secured by the usual means. Silvela even went so far as to issue a circular, pointing out the pains and penalties provided by law for all forms of electoral corruption. It must be said that scoffers in Madrid made merry over this return to political purity. Without directly impugning Premier Silvela's honesty, they remarked that he was associated with some uncommonly wicked partners, and that his Minister of War, Gen. Polavieja, was in particular running the campaign in the good old high-handed way. But, pure or corrupt, the election passed off on Sunday, as was predicted, in the midst of great popular indifference. The number of votes cast was small, as in Spain the people have become weary of the political farce, and have lost interest in the game of punishing one boss by rewarding a worse one.

More important for Spain than the personnel of Cortes or Ministry is the question of the country's financial recuperation. On this subject a French economist, M. Edmond Théry, holds optimistic views. He was sent to Madrid by the French Government to make an expert study of Spanish finance, and his report, though not yet published in full, has been outlined. M. Théry considers Spain's case as anything but hopeless, and says that if—much virtue in this *if*—a competent statesman were at the head of her affairs, she might show the world as rapid a recovery as that of France after 1871. He maintains that Spain can meet all her engagements without too severely increasing the burden of taxation. The first measure which he expects to see the Government adopt when the Cortes assemble in June is a suspension of the sinking-fund until the country regains a better financial position. England cannot criticise such a scheme, as her Chancellor of the Exchequer has just embraced it, nor can the United States, as our Treasury has found it highly convenient to disregard the law calling for payments on the sinking-fund account. The remainder of the Spanish financial programme is an increase of revenue from public monopolies, tobacco, alcohol, etc.; higher import duties; an income tax on securities, as high as 20 per cent.; and an export duty on minerals. This last may be regarded as a sly blow at England, as British capital is largely interested in the Rio Tinto mines and in the export of hematite and other ores. But this tax will be in any case a light one—2 per cent. is the rate proposed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION-PROHIBITED

OUR SAVAGE WAR "FOR THE CAUSE OF HUMANITY."

In a few days it will be a year since the United States went to war with Spain "for the cause of humanity." The war with Spain ceased months ago, the freeing of Cuba from her domination having been accomplished, but a large army of our troops is still engaged in fighting. Having started out to give the inhabitants of Cuba their independence, we are now insisting that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, who had also revolted against Spanish rule, shall acknowledge our supremacy over them.

This war is the most savage war which was ever known in the history of our republic. The brief official dispatches from the commanders of our troops cast little light upon the situation, but thousands of private soldiers are every week sending home letters which tell the horrible truth with all the impressiveness of native eloquence. The war of 1898 "for the cause of humanity" has degenerated in 1899 into a war of conquest, characterized by rapine and cruelty worthy of savages. The wanton destruction of property by our army has been boasted of by our soldiers. E. B. Furman of the regiment from the State of Washington, writing of the battles of February 4 and 5, said that "we burned hundreds of houses and looted hundreds more," and that "we have horses and carriages and bull-carts galore, and enough furniture and other plunder to load a steamer." Capt. Albert Otis, describing his own exploits at Santa Ana, wrote that "I have six horses and three carriages in my yard, and enough small plunder for a family of six." Guy Williams of the Iowa regiment, after describing the abandonment of a village by the inhabitants, wrote:

"The soldiers made short work of the whole thing. They looted every house and found almost everything from a pair of wooden shoes up to a piano, and they carried everything off or destroyed it. *Talk of the natives plundering the towns—I don't think they are in it with the Fiftieth Iowa.*"

Wholesale plundering is bad enough, but it is not the worst feature of our warfare. The fact is now fully established that in many cases the rule has been that *our troops take no prisoners.* There can no longer be any question about this. Private letters from a number of soldiers in different regiments tell the same story. Charles Brenner of Minneapolis, Kan., in describing the part played by his regiment in the fight at Caloocan, wrote:

"Company I had taken a few prisoners and stopped. The Colonel ordered them up into line time after time, and finally sent Capt. Bishop back to start them. *Then occurred the hardest sight I ever saw. They had four prisoners and didn't know what to do with them. They asked Capt. Bishop what to do and he said, 'You know the orders,' and four natives fell dead.*"

Leonard F. Adams of Ozark, Mo., who is in the Washington regiment, describes the terrible slaughter of natives in the battle of February 4, after which "we went over the battlefield in squads, burying the dead niggers"; tells how he "saw seventy-four buried in one hole"; says that "in the path of the Washington regiment and Battery D of the Sixth Artillery there were 1,008 dead niggers, and a great many wounded"; and adds:

"*I don't know how many men, women, and children the Tennessee boys did kill. They would not take any prisoners. One company of the Tennessee boys was sent into headquarters with thirty prisoners, and got there with about a hundred chickens and no prisoners.*"

The Brooklyn *Eagle* of Sunday published a private letter just received from Fred B. Hinchman, formerly a student in the Polytechnic Institute, who is now serving with Company A, United States Engineers, and whose testimony on this point would of itself be conclusive, as "I am connected with the provost marshal's headquarters, have had a particularly good opportunity of observing 'symptoms,' and in some cases have had an insight into things which were not generally known." Writing from Manila on the 22d of February, he describes the first engagement between our forces and the natives, and in the course of his narrative says:

"At 1:30 o'clock the General gave me a memorandum with regard to sending out a Tennessee battalion to the line. He tersely put it that 'they were looking for a fight.' At the Puente Colgante (suspension bridge) I met one of our company, who told me that *the Fourteenth and Washingtons were driving all before them, and taking no prisoners. This is now our rule of procedure for cause.* After delivering my message I had not walked a block when I heard shots down the street. Hurrying forward, I found a group of our men taking pot shots across the river into a bamboo thicket, at about 1,200 yards. I longed to join them, but had my reply to take back, and that, of course, was the first thing to attend to. I reached the office at three P. M. *just in time to see a platoon of the Washingtons with about fifty prisoners, who had been taken before they learned how not to take them.*"

It must be said, to the credit of our soldiers, that while in the heat of battle they carry out the orders to take no prisoners, most of them inwardly revolt at the idea of such barbarism, and want to come home. Sergeant Elliott of Company G, in the Kansas regiment, who returned last week with the body of his father, captain of the company, talked in this frank way to a reporter of the Kansas City *Star:*

"Most of the general officers think it will take years and a large force of soldiers to thoroughly subjugate the natives. And the unpleasant feature of this is that unless the conditions change radically, there will be few soldiers who will care to stay there. There's no use trying to conceal the fact that many of the men over there now, especially the volunteers, are homesick and tired of fighting way off there with nothing in particular to gain. There is not one man in the whole army now in the Philippines who would not willingly give up his life for the flag if it was necessary, but it isn't pleasant to think about dying at the hands of a foe little better than a savage, and so far away from home. And the thought of its not ending for several years is not an especially pleasant one, either."

The truthfulness of this picture is established by the *Herald's* dispatches on Monday. The censor at Manila allowed the *Herald's* correspondent to state that Gen. Lawton is evacuating the towns beyond Laguna de Bay, from which the insurgents were driven a few days ago, and to quote this admission by Gen. Lawton:

"With the forces I have there is no doubt I could go through the whole island; but if a government is to be established, it will be necessary to garrison all the towns. *It would take 100,000 men to pacify the islands.* I regret the necessity of abandoning the captured territory."

The correspondent of the *Herald* at Washington says that "the desire of the volunteers to return to this country is evidenced in a report which shows that of those who have been offered opportunity to reënlist, with the offer of a bonus in travel-pay of over $500, only about 7 per cent. will accept. The volunteers, it is stated, desire to come home by organizations, instead of individually." Such is the shocking conclusion of the war "for the cause of humanity" begun in Cuba.

A PLAN FOR THE PHILIPPINES.

Any proposal to unravel the Philippine snarl must, of course, look straight at the facts as they exist to-day. The march of events has changed the problem from month to month. Last May the solution was to order Dewey to refit and recoal and sail away. This was the course urgently pressed at the time upon Mr. McKinley by Senator Sewell. The President rejected the advice, and soon it became too late to take it even if he wanted to. Other solutions were possible before the meeting of the Paris Commission—before the ratification of the treaty by the Senate—before the fighting broke out in the islands; but those events successively put a new face on the difficulty, and compelled new plans to solve it. To-day we have full legal authority to do what we will in the Philippines. The islands are ours before the law of nations. But no nation on earth, unless it be an enemy to us, is satisfied with the Philippine situation. Our best friends, the English, are not; this country itself is not. The case cries loudly for some change of policy. What shall it be? What course, at once prudent and practicable, can be adopted to put an end to a strife which is both humiliating and fruitless?

We find in the *London and China Telegraph* an interview with a man who knows the Malays well, and knows Americans well, and who thinks he sees the true policy for us to pursue. It is Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, the distinguished naturalist, and what he says is this:

"Surely it is possible [for the Americans] to revert to their first-expressed intention of taking a small island only as a naval and coaling-station, and to declare themselves the protectors of the islands against foreign aggression. Having done this, they might invite the civilized portion of the natives to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form an independent government, offering them advice and assistance if they wish for it, but otherwise leaving them completely free. It might be advisable first to leave the great island of Mindanao, mostly inhabited by Mohammedans, to form its own separate government; and some guarantee might properly be asked for the fair treatment of the uncivilized portion of the population, such as the presence of a few American residents as protectors of the aborigines. By some such method as here suggested the great republic of the West might aid in the production of a new type of social development adapted to the character of the Malayan race."

Let it be noted that this suggested solution of the difficulty steers clear of the great objections which have been made to other plans. It does not propose to "hand back" the islands to Spain. Most Americans, we presume, would be glad to hand them to Spain or any other Power foolish enough to take them; but it is too late to do that now. The islands are ours for better or worse, for richer or poorer. But Dr. Wallace himself does not contemplate that we should leave the Philippines a prey to scrambling foreign Powers, and so perhaps bring on a European war. We are to announce ourselves their protectors. We are to defend them against foreign aggression. In short, we are to follow the well-approved English plan of declaring a protectorate, and then leaving the natives to develop the best indigenous government they can. An American protectorate over the Philippines, the recognition of American suzerainty by the inhabitants, would be a very different thing from administrative supremacy. It would mean American sovereignty and supremacy for a time in all that affected the foreign relations of the islands; it would mean suitable guarantees for the protection of life and property; it would, of course, mean American garrisons as the sufficient symbol of American power; it would mean the protection of one island or one race from possible aggressions on the part of another; but it would also mean the free development of native life and local rule, and, above all, it would mean the immediate ending of the aimless and bloody fighting which is disgracing us in the eyes of the world.

The Filipinos would accept an American protectorate. They are eager for it, unless they have changed their minds since last August. The testimony from their leaders laid before our Paris Commissioners was emphatic on this point. They knew that they could not protect their own islands against voracious European countries. They desired also the presence of a strong American force while the first experiments in native government were being undertaken. We should then have been assisting, instead of crushing out, what Prof. William James has called "the sacredest thing in this great human world"—the attempt of a people long enslaved to attain to the possession of itself, to organize its laws and government, to be free to follow its internal destinies according to its own ideals."

That milk is spilled, and there is no use in crying over it now. But is it too late to retrace our steps and do in effect what we should have done long ago? It seems to us that it is not. In fact, the way seems easy. As the case stands, our dispute with the Filipinos is largely a dispute about words. If the first article of the proclamation of the Philippine Commission were verbally changed, there is no doubt that the natives would accept it with enthusiasm. Suppose that instead of reading, "The supremacy of the United States must and will be enforced throughout every part of the archipelago, and those who resist can accomplish nothing but their own ruin," it had stood, "The United States declares itself protector of the Philippine Islands against foreign aggression, and calls upon the natives to set up their own internal government." It is clear that the war would have ended on the spot; that all the rest of the proclamation, so admirable in its promises of local control of local affairs, guarantees of civil and religious rights, a pure judiciary, and so on, would have been put into effect without the firing of another shot, the leaving of another Filipino to die a death of slow torture in the jungle, or the killing of another American soldier ordered to massacre the people whom he thought he was sent to free.

Now, the point we insist upon is that this plan, Mr. Wallace's plan, would give us all that we can get under any plan, and give it to us peacefully. A protectorate would be as good for American trade as would administrative supremacy; the islands are open to the commerce of the world in either case. Under the proclamation, it was proposed to give the natives "the amplest liberty of self-government"; that could be still better given, and just as well safeguarded, under a protectorate. So with all the rest of it. If we are honest in saying that we wish only to develop and build up the Philippines, instead of ruthlessly exploiting them, we must confess that we could do the work as well under a protectorate as under a sovereignty asserted throughout every part of every island. As kindly protectors, instead of boastful sovereigns, we should be able to discharge all our duties to the world which we have assumed by expelling the Spaniards from the Philippines; should get just as much profit and more praise ourselves; and should implant in the breasts of the natives gratitude and hope where now we are rousing hatred and revenge. We need only realize that it is possible to benefit lower races without first crushing them under the heel of a conqueror; need only understand, with Dr. Wallace, that even the most benevolent conquests sow seeds of misery among the conquered, and terribly retard their natural development. Our mistakes in the Philippines have, so far, been egregious. Even Jingoes privately admit it; history will write it inexorably. But we may still do much to redeem the situation if we will now frankly face it, choose the words and the acts which best suit the wishes of the natives, instead of our vulgar pride, and by wise conciliation, by patience, by experiment after experiment, prove to the Filipinos that liberty does not mean repression and death, but the opening of the prison door and opportunity for manhood.

THE CAUSE OF PEACE.

On the 29th of March a very interesting event took place at the Foreign Office in London. A deputation of extraordinary magnitude and interest waited on Mr. Balfour, who for the nonce took Lord Salisbury's place. Now "when a mind like Mr. Balfour's," as the silver men used to say, treats a subject of which he is master, as he is of this though he was not of the subject of silver, it is an important event. The subject on this occasion was peace as presented by the Czar's proposal. The deputation was introduced by Lord Aberdeen, who explained for what it stood. He said the gathering was "to an unusual degree representative." The meetings whose views it put forward had been held throughout England, north, south, east, and west; and though people of all shades of opinion had been admitted to them, though ample opportunities for discussion were given, they spoke with one voice, deliberately approving the Czar's proposal. It represented the "whole of the thinking public." These meetings, too, were not meetings of clubs or associations. They were meetings of the towns and cities, called by their mayors or other authorities.

The proceedings were opened by the Bishop of London, who is probably one of the least visionary or sentimental of English public men of prominence. This is how he introduced the matter:

"No subject had been received with such complete enthusiasm and unanimity as this subject of the promotion of peace; there was no subject on which the English people had been approached for a long time in which they had shown such deep interest. And this was the more remarkable, for the English public were not given to the expression of ideas in the abstract; and those who had stood aloof had probably done so in order to see what would come of the endeavor before they expressed a strong opinion on the subject. The meetings had been held without any connection with current topics of political controversy, which, as a rule, lent a fictitious interest to proceedings; they had been attended by thinking men and women, who were profoundly impressed with the importance of the opportunity now offered of supporting, by every means in their power, this totally unexpected attempt towards disarmament on the part of one of the principal Powers in the politics of Europe."

Mr. Balfour spoke in the same strain. He said peace was "not only one of the greatest interests of the British Empire, but one of the greatest interests of the world, and that all England feels so." He based on the lessons of the past the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hope and expectation that war was going to be, perhaps not extinguished, but greatly diminished.

"Since the conclusion of the great revolutionary wars this country has only once been at war with a civilized Power. That is to say, in a period of more than eighty years our peace with the civilized nations of the earth has only been disturbed for a single period of about three years. Compare that with what went on in the last century. A man of forty at the present time has never seen war in this country. A man of forty in the last century—put that period of forty years where you will in the century—would certainly have seen two wars, might well have seen three, and it might even happen that of those forty years the greater part were spent in war, and not in peace. The change is an enormous one."

He drew attention to the fact that, in spite of the incessant talk of the day about "armaments," improved guns, more destructive ships, the reluctance of civilized nations to go to war plainly increases; that the growth of those in favor of peace which seemed so feeble only one hundred years ago, is now strong, and is one of the strongest guiding factors of national policy. This is sadly important, because it comes at a moment when one of the commonest topics of debate and conversation with us is, not how to promote peace, but whether we ought not to form "an alliance" with British Jingoes to kill brown people and seize their property. We are, at the moment these things are being said in London by some of the foremost men of our race, engaged in a war, carried on with mediæval atrocity, in which every advance made in morals or law or religion by Christendom is flouted or depreciated. We are preaching a new sixteenth-century view of nature and national greatness which Philip the Second of Spain would have endorsed. We are throwing cold water on that great American doctrine of the supremacy of the law above men, probably the noblest product of our Revolution. We are confessing the insufficiency of the Christian religion for the formation of character without occasional attacks on people who may never have injured us in mind, body, or estate, in order to kill them and destroy their property. And, worse than all, we hear these very sentiments from the sacred desk, from men who pretend to hold a commission from Jesus Christ.

It is the most astounding case of backsliding which has ever occurred in the history of civilization. As the Turk is fading away—a striking illustration of the folly of force, to use no stronger term—we, the "foremost in the files of time," are trying to step into his place and become the savage bully of Christendom which he was in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; a nation which cares not to be powerful through morals and laws, but through capacity for slaughter and plunder.

THE CROKER SYSTEM.

It is said proudly of Croker, by himself as well as by his friends, that there is no humbug about him—that whatever else he may be he is no hypocrite. His testimony on the witness stand confirms this view of him. He frankly confesses his rulership of the city, and asserts his rights to the emoluments of his government. If the people of the city do not like the picture which he draws of their condition as his subjects and serfs, that does not trouble him a particle. He is what he is through their permission, and if they feel humiliated by his contemptuous references to them, and by the disgrace with which his open avowal of his power brands them as free-born American citizens, they have only themselves to blame. He shows himself without concealment to be a ruler who is as dull of moral sense, and as indifferent to the character and good reputation of his associates and allies, as he is ignorant and brutal. If any of his associates are ashamed of his company and leadership, he does not spare their feelings. He is thoroughly satisfied with himself and his system, and they had best be the same.

His treatment of his Mayor is especially characteristic. He himself, and not the Mayor, selected the subordinate officers of the city government. He, and not the Mayor, sits with these officers at The Club and discusses all matters of public business, including especially the selection of subordinates. "I am the leader of the party, and I acknowledge it," he says. "At the present time your influence is greater than that of any man you know?" he is asked, and he nods complacently in the affirmative. Quite right, he is too. There is no power on earth at all comparable to it, when we consider that it is self-assumed and is exercised without any responsibility whatever to the people who pay the cost of it. He selects nominees for public office, including judicial positions, but he cannot quite admit that they pay such high prices for the latter as $12,000 or $18,000 each. He is chairman of his own Finance Committee, but he does "not know always" what money comes into his hands, and does "not always" keep an account of what he receives. When checks are made out to his order, he endorses them. A little light upon the extreme caution with which he conducts his exchequer is thrown by the testimony of ex-Justice Pryor, who was assessed $10,000 for his nomination in 1891. Mr. Pryor made his check payable to the order of Richard Croker, but the next day Mike Daly, the ever-faithful, brought it back with a request that he make it payable "to bearer," which he did.

No part of Mr. Croker's testimony is more illuminating than that in which he sets forth frankly what he expects of the men to whom he sells judicial nominations. He expects all of them to do their duty by Tammany, but "they don't always do it." Which ones do not? "I don't want to talk about men that has not done that. There is men on the bench now that has not done that—a few of them." Those who do their duty always appoint good Tammany men as referees. The referees, among other things, select the auctioneers, and good Tammany referees always select Peter F. Meyer of the firm of Meyer & Croker. When referees appoint this firm they "do good party acts." The full testimony on this point is too valuable to be condensed:

"Q. And the judge ought to do that thing which puts into your pocket money, because you are a Democrat, too? A. Yes.

"Q. Then we have this: that you participate in the selection of judges before they are elected, and then participate in emolument that comes away down at the end of their judicial proceedings, namely, in judicial sales? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. And it goes into your pocket? A. Yes, that is my own money.

"Q. And the nomination of the judges by Tammany Hall in this city is almost equivalent to an election, is it not? A. Yes.

"Q. So that if you have a controlling voice in the affairs of your party and secure the nomination of true men, you may be sure that at least in the Real-Estate Exchange and in the firm of Meyer & Croker you will, as a true Democrat, get some of the patronage? A. We expect them at least to be friendly.

"Q. And get a part of the patronage? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. You are working for your own pocket? A. All the time, and you too.

"Q. Then, it is not a matter of wide statesmanship or patriotism altogether, but it is wide statesmanship, patriotism, and personal gain mixed up? A. It is, 'To the party belongs the spoils.' I will say that, so you can make it all right up here. We win, and everybody stands by us when we win."

Croker said voluntarily of the profits of this branch of his "private business": "I want to say to you now that my half in that business has amounted to $25,000 or $30,000 right along for the last six or seven years." That is a tidy income to receive by means of a "pull" on the bench. Without that "pull," the business would not have been worth a copper. In view of this admission, Croker's fervid declaration that he will sacrifice his right hand if any one can show he has taken a dollar of city money, gives us a sample of his moral sense. He uses the power of his position as boss to levy blackmail through the bench, and then calls the result "private business."

The generalization from this revelation to the whole Croker system of government is easy and logical, but when Mr. Moss tried on Friday to get Croker to say that what went on in relation to referees and judicial sales went on in relation to all other varieties of the spoils of victory, the boss was wary and pretended not to understand him. This does not throw the slightest doubt on the matter, however. It is the natural and incontestable inference that the boss who takes this view of a judge's duties should take a like view of the duties of all other of his nominees to whom he has sold offices. Ex-Justice Daly gave under oath on Friday the familiar narrative of his exclusion by Croker from the bench

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because he would not favor the transfer of the place for judicial sales to the office of Meyer & Croker, and because he would not, at Croker's request, appoint Mike Daly to a clerkship. Young Croker and Croker's nephew have shown how the boss works the Building Department for his private pocket; why should any one doubt that he works all other departments in the municipal service in the same way? As he himself says, he has to "get a living." That he gets an extremely good one, is notorious. The people of the city are supporting him in great affluence, and it is not surprising that their docility under his power, as well as their generous treatment of him, should make him a bit arrogant at times.

It is extremely edifying to see the same Republicans who are unable to find anything objectionable in Platt's methods of party leadership, hold up their hands in horror over the revelation that Croker has been using his own sons as collectors of revenue for his peculiar government. To think, they say, of a father introducing his own offspring to such a life as that! Is there any difference between what Croker has done and what everybody knows Platt has been doing for the past five or six years? Has not Platt been using one son in the family law business and another in the family surety company in precisely the same way in which Croker has been using his son and nephew? If a contractor wished to have his kind of fireproofing authorized for use by the Building Department, he either took a Croker boy into partnership, or retained a Croker nephew as "counsel" at a fee of $5,000 or $10,000. If a citizen wished during the past few years to get a bill through the Legislature, and retained the Old Man's family law firm as counsel, it was at once "sure to pass," was it not? If a contractor wished to get a piece of canal work under Aldridge, he took out his bond from the Old Man's Surety Company, did he not? In short, have not both bosses used their sons in the same way—that is, to get profit for themselves by putting forth the boys as repositories of the "pull"? If not, will some good Republican point out the difference to us?

Croker himself asserted this fellowship in his testimony on Saturday. When asked to reveal the business enterprises of his boys, he protested:

> "All this talk is very well, but why don't you go and examine the man that created you and sent you here? Go and investigate the office of Tracy, Boardman & Platt. There is more corruption in that office than in any office in this town. They are retained by nearly every corporation in this town. Go and attend to them. Go and investigate the man you get your retainer from, Mr. Moss; [turning to the chairman] the man who made you possible; Platt is the man I mean."

If this were a non-partisan inquiry, both bosses would be put on the stand, but everybody knows that the committee would not dare to accept Croker's challenge, and put Platt on the stand, or Platt's sons and their partners; and knows, furthermore, that Mr. Moss would not be allowed to question Platt and his boys as he has questioned Croker and his. We have always affirmed that one boss is as bad as the other, and that there is no difference in their systems of government. It is edifying and amusing to see Croker asserting this fact as in some sort a justification for himself.

THE CANDIDACY OF BRYAN.

Mr. Bryan's speech at the One Dollar Dinner must be viewed with reference to his candidacy. It was more moderate in tone than was generally expected, and perhaps more so than his audience desired. The latter came together prepared for "hot stuff," and the speaker could not have given them too much of it. On the other hand, he gave them a very tame discourse as compared with his speeches in the last Presidential campaign. On the silver question, he charged that President McKinley had pursued a negative rather than a positive course, which is true, but it is also true of Mr. Bryan in this instance. He did not even say what he would do if all power were placed in his hands. He limited himself to some criticism of the policy of the Republican party, and it is worth while to inquire whether this criticism is well founded or not.

Mr. Bryan assumed rather calmly that the gold standard was a foreign contrivance, more particularly British. It was at all events un-American. He looked into the Chicago platform for his proof. It was easy to pass from this assumption to the other one, that the American standard, (or as he prefers to call it, the double standard) is silver, and that all persons who consider the existing gold standard American, and who stand by it, are radicals and destructives, while those who are for changing it are conservatives. Hence his words: "They [the Republicans] are destructive, not constructive; they oppose without proposing." This was the most exciting phrase in his whole speech, and it reads rather tamely by the side of his previous utterances on the same subject. Mild as it is in tone, however, it cannot be accepted until all the rules of logic, from Aristotle down, are turned topsy-turvy. The conservatives are those who conserve, and the destructives are those who destroy, or would if they could. The gold standard, according to Mr. Bryan's party, was introduced into this country by "the crime of 1873." That act had no significance or meaning otherwise. The gold standard had been introduced *de facto* in 1834; but, if we allow room for all kinds of quibbles on that point, the truth still remains, that the gold standard has existed here *de facto* and *de jure* for more than a quarter of a century, and is now on a firmer basis than ever before in the country's history. Even if we were to suppose that it is more foreign, or more British, than American, it has been ours by free choice for nearly a whole generation. Nobody imposed it upon us from abroad in the first instance, and nobody has prevented us from casting it off since. Nobody has been strong enough to do so. Therefore, Mr. Bryan's assumption that the gold standard is un-American falls to the ground, notwithstanding the high authority of the Chicago platform, which he helped to make, and with it falls his solemn argument that the Republicans are destructive and not constructive in this particular, and that they oppose without proposing. They are neither destructive nor constructive. They simply hold fast to what exists. That Mr. Bryan should find some support from the Wolcott Commission, which President McKinley sent abroad in 1897, is nothing to the purpose. This merely proves that Mr. McKinley was tarred with the same stick, but to a less extent than Bryan himself.

Very little fault is to be found with any other part of Mr. Bryan's speech. His remarks about an income tax are moderate in tone, and those on the war in the Philippines might have been stronger without passing the bounds of just criticism. He discountenanced the Trusts and combines that have multiplied so enormously of late, but not too vigorously. What he said about government by injunction was tame in comparison with his earlier sayings on the same subject. Altogether, the speech leaves the impression that he desired not to offend the conservative element of the Democratic party, or to make united action, with him as a candidate, impossible next year. Yet we doubt if he has succeeded in it. The chasm between himself and the Gold Democrats —those who voted for McKinley and Hobart in 1896, as well as those who voted for Palmer and Buckner—is still so wide that if he had ignored the silver question altogether they could not take him for their candidate next year.

According to present appearances, however, the South, which is the controlling element in the Democratic party, will insist upon making the fight again on the silver issue, and in that event Bryan is the inevitable nominee, and the party will be thrashed at the polls again, although it will be their turn next year to win. Silver is not the question that most engages public attention now. It is not nearly as attractive an issue as it was three years ago. All the enthusiasm, all the spontaneity, have gone out of it. It was not this that gave Mr. Bryan his warm greeting at the One Dollar Dinner, but himself as the party's standard-bearer in the last campaign. It cannot be affirmed again that the gold standard is the cause of hard times

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—the hard times have gone, but the gold standard remains. Ancient prejudice against Great Britain will not serve the turn now, because the prejudice does not exist. More votes will be lost than gained by inveighing against the British gold standard. Nobody can say with a straight face that there is not gold enough to do the world's business, or to maintain prices. In short, a campaign on that issue next year will be an anachronism, and will become a weariness or a laughing-stock before the voting takes place. Yet it seems now as though the masters of the Democratic party in the South would have it so. Something may occur in the next twelvemonth to change the drift of sentiment in the South, but it has not shown itself as yet.

AN ACADEMIC DISCUSSION OF EXPANSION.

PHILADELPHIA, April 12, 1899.

The third annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, held in this city on April 7-8, ranks easily as the most important incident in the life of the organization. Founded ten years ago through the personal endeavors of energetic leaders, the pretentious title and novel methods of the organization exposed it to sharp criticism and inevitable discredit. A sagacious administrative policy and an increasing scientific activity have done much to change this attitude within the past few years. The Academy is neither in fact nor in purpose a scientific body such as the American Economic Association or the American Historical Association; but at the present time few economists or historians are unaffiliated with the organization, and none can afford to neglect its proceedings and its publications. Not only for the important local influence it has exerted, but for the stimulus and direction it has given to the intelligent discussion of matters of grave public concern, the Academy has within a decade of more or less experimental activity fully justified its existence.

Three years ago the policy of an annual scientific meeting, held in Philadelphia during the spring recess, was adopted. A traditional programme of miscellaneous papers engaged the first meeting. In 1898 the advantage of specialized discussion was recognized, and the sessions were devoted to the consideration of a single topic—the scope and method of sociology. The same practice prevailed in the present year, and the interest of a larger circle was enlisted by the selection, as the theme of the meeting, of "The Foreign Policy of the United States: Commercial and Political." The skilful arrangement of the programme, the representative character of the participants, and the significance of the papers presented were the elements that placed this last meeting in an entirely different category from any of those which had preceded.

The first session, on Friday afternoon, was devoted to the general subject, "The Government of Dependencies." Formal papers were presented with this common title by Prof. Theodore S. Woolsey of Yale, Prof. E. W. Huffcut of Cornell, Mr. A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard, and Mr. W. Alleyne Ireland of London. In scholarship and definiteness these papers were probably the most satisfactory of any presented at the meeting. The actual condition of affairs arising out of the war with Spain was in each case confronted, and certain definite rules of practical conduct were proposed.

Prof. Woolsey called attention to the two theories underlying the relationship between a state and its dependencies. The first, represented by the Dutch rule in Java, regards colonies as property from which an income is to be drawn; the second, exemplified by British colonial policy, considers them a kind of trust to be administered for the benefit of the inhabitants, while the profit to the mother state comes in the enlarged opportunities for the energies of its surplus youth and in that stimulated trade which follows the flag. The second principle will, doubtless, shape the form of government to be adopted for the new dependencies placed under our sovereignty. Porto Rico presents materials for a State after Territorial apprenticeship; or, as an unorganized Territory, we may watch it working out its ideas of self-government. In the Philippines, different social, racial, and geographical conditions render a similar policy impossible, and instruction may be derived from a study of the results of British administration in India. It seems clear that a civil government for these islands, under our Constitution, is, and must be for the indefinite future, inadmissible. Military government, dependent upon the inaction of Congress, is the only course possible.

The constitutional problems involved in the government of dependencies by the United States were discussed with acuteness and learning by Prof. Huffcut. A detailed analysis of all the constitutional restrictions upon congressional power and of all the pronouncements of the federal courts relating thereto, resulted in the conclusion that it is possible to hold, with entire loyalty to the Constitution and respect for judicial decisions, that all dependencies, except the District of Columbia, are governed under the general power given to Congress "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States"; that this power is limited only by the provision prohibiting slavery within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction; that no decision of the Supreme Court holds that any other limit is placed upon the power of Congress over the Territories, and that such dicta as may be found to the contrary either are wholly discredited, or resolve themselves into a mere statement of constitutional or political theory.

Mr. Lowell assumed the two propositions which the preceding papers had established, viz., that our primary aim is to be the welfare of the dependencies, and that the Federal Constitution will not interfere seriously with the establishment of the most desirable form of government in our new possessions. It is not improbable that our institutions can be applied to the Sandwich Islands without modification, and a Territorial government copied from the pattern that has proved successful in the West will doubtless be there employed. In the Philippines the task is that of ruling a tropical colony where the proportion of white men must always remain insignificant, and where the natives, except in the case of selected individuals, will be incapable of taking part in the government for an indefinite period. The most important requisites for the administration of such a colony are justice, a consistent policy, and a thorough knowledge of the native character. For Porto Rico, the obvious solution would appear to be a Territorial administration, with a governor appointed by the President, and a Legislature composed partly of appointed and partly of elected members.

Mr. Ireland, speaking from the experience of long residence in the British colonies, expressed the opinion that the inhabitants of the tropics will never be capable of self-government in the sense which is usually attached to that expression, and that without the strong hand of the man of the North to hold things together, the tropics will never advance beyond the point which has been reached by the Central American republics.

The annual address to the Academy, delivered by the Hon. Carl Schurz on Friday evening, under the title "Militarism and Democracy," served as a wholesome corrective of the matter-of-fact, indeed cheerful, acquiescence in the existing state of affairs which characterized the afternoon's proceedings. Defining militarism as the system which makes the maintenance of great armaments one of the principal objects of the state, Mr. Schurz proceeded, with philosophic spirit and unerring logic, to trace the opposition of such a system to the democratic spirit, and to describe the danger it offers to democratic institutions. The development of militarism in European states is explained by the necessity which each Power conceives itself to be under to protect itself from, and to preserve peace among, its neighbors. In the United States the need for large armaments can result only from a spirit of warlike adventure, beginning, perhaps, in a desire to liberate and civilize certain foreign populations, but developing into a downright and reckless policy of conquest. There was a stirring quality of comprehensive grasp and large statesmanship in Mr. Schurz's address, and no more accurate key-phrase for its content could be found than one of its happiest epigrams: "War makes military heroes, but makes also civic cowards."

Our commercial relations with the Far East formed the general topic of Saturday afternoon's session. Formal papers were presented by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, late Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States Treasury Department, and by Mr. Robert T. Hill of the United States Geological Survey. Briefer addresses were made by Mr. John Foord, Secretary of the American Asiatic Association, by Dr. W. P. Wilson, director of the Philadelphia Commercial Museums, and Prof. E. R. Johnson of the University of Pennsylvania. It was inevitable that a discussion of commercial development should resolve itself into a series of conflicting forecasts; yet the most tolerant mind experienced a keen sense of disappointment at the hopeless antagonism of expert opinion. To Mr. Ford, the commercial opportunities of the United States in the Far East seemed rigidly limited, even though Manila be maintained as a free port or employed as a manufacturing basis. To Mr. Hill, the development of China under the protective policy of European nations meant opportunity for our young men and markets for our wares, while continued Chinese methods presented not one ray of hope for national profit. To Mr. Foord, the natural line of commercial advance lay in the positive support by the United States of the policy of the open door in China. Dr. Wilson found the key to the situation in a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

larger energy and bolder initiative of the American merchant and manufacturer, and Prof. Johnson cast an apparently well-founded discredit upon the statistical basis of the debate.

The final session of the meeting on Saturday night was devoted to the political relations of the United States with the Far East. If not the most profitable, this was certainly the most brilliant session. Prof. John Bassett Moore presented a brief historical review of our diplomatic intercourse with the East, naturally revealing the scholarly academician rather than the efficient diplomatist. The main address, upon "China's Relation with the West," was made by the Chinese Minister, his Excellency Wu Ting-Fang. We have probably had no more skilful presentation of the case of China and her claims than this forcible statement of one of her most distinguished representatives. The gradual but sure advance of Chinese civilization, the mischievous effects of "proselytism" and "commercialism" in the Far East, and the antithesis between the ethical pretence and actual practice of Western nations in their dealings with China, were described with extraordinary skill and ability. In a rather misplaced "discussion" that followed the important address of the evening, Prof. Lindley M. Keasbey suggested that our guiding policy in the Far East be economic competition with all and political alliance with none. Prof. Frederick W. Williams of Yale found in Russian aggression the real menace of China and the world, and urged that we harken before it is too late to "the Macedonian cry of that misgoverned nation to go over and help them." Vividness and color were given to the discussions of the meeting by a special exhibit of the products of the Far East at the Commercial Museums, arranged and described in an informal address on Saturday morning by Director W. P. Wilson.

The Council of the Academy took steps for the publication at an early date of the proceedings of the meeting in full, and for the provision of a permanent home for the organization. The only change in the officers of the Academy was the election as Corresponding Secretary of Prof. L. S. Rowe, to whose energy as chairman of the local committee the success of the meeting was largely due. J. H. H.

HOUSSAYE'S WATERLOO.

PARIS, April 5, 1899.

M. Henry Houssaye is writing the history of the fall of the First Empire, with the help of original documents. The two first volumes of this work had for their titles: '1814-1815—The First Restoration, The Return from Elba, The Hundred Days.' The last and third volume has just appeared under the title, '1815—Waterloo.' Many accounts of the battle of Waterloo have been written. M. Houssaye has evidently had the ambition to write the last and to leave nothing behind him for future historians. He enters first into infinite details upon the last army of the Empire, the army which Napoleon organized after his return from Elba. For this purpose he has availed himself of the documents found in the archives of the Ministry of War. Napoleon found only 200,000 men under the French flag on his return. "If," says M. Houssaye, "he had had his old absolute power, he would have doubled the army by an extraordinary call of the classes of 1806 to 1814, by the recall of the class of 1815, and the call by anticipation of the class of 1816." But he hesitated, having only just seized the crown again, before so unpopular a measure as the reëstablishment of the conscription, which had been abolished by Louis XVIII. His only resource was the recall to the regiments of the soldiers who were absent on limited or unlimited leaves, and the recall of the great number of deserters who figured on the regimental lists as "absent without permission." The men who were absent on leave were 32,800, the deserters 85,000. It was difficult to count on many of this last number. Napoleon feared, besides, to put the army too suddenly on a war-footing; he was trying by all means to enter into negotiation with the Powers to maintain peace. The French population wished ardently for the continuation of peace. The west of France was agitated, the south was partly in arms; the royalists all over France predicted war. As soon as all hope was given up of an understanding with the Powers, Napoleon published his decree; the French funds in one day suffered a fall of eight francs. France felt that she must prepare for a terrible war, perhaps for a new invasion.

The feeling of the country is well shown by the number of free volunteers: there were only 15,000. Napoleon had to augment the regular army by the mobilization of the National Guard. He would have much liked to keep the four Swiss regiments of the army of Louis XVIII., but the Swiss officers refused to exchange the white cockade for the tricolor, and these regiments had to be disbanded. He could keep only two foreign regiments, Isenberg and the Irish regiment. Of the 234,720 National Guards who were called into active service, 150,000 were on their way to their regiments on the 15th of June; they were not enthusiastic, but resigned, and determined to do their duty.

The correspondence of Napoleon shows what immense pains he took to equip and organize completely his new army, to form the corps, to choose the troops of the first line. The command of the corps was of the greatest importance. Of the twenty marshals of France, three had accompanied Louis XVIII. to Belgium—Berthier, Marmont, Victor. Many of the others were wavering and did not inspire Napoleon with great confidence. He was especially discontented with Ney, but, after some hesitation, he wrote to the Minister of War: "Call for Marshal Ney, and tell him that if he wishes to be in the first battles, he must go on the 14th to Avesnes, where my headquarters will be." Napoleon refused to give a command to Murat; he had not forgiven him for having begun hostilities so late in 1814 against the Austrians. He regretted this decision at St. Helena. "At Waterloo," he said in one of those conversations, or rather monologues, which have just been repeated to us in the Memoirs of Gourgaud, "Murat would perhaps have given us the victory. What did we need? To break three or four English squares. Murat was just the man for it." Grouchy was an able officer, and like Murat could handle well great masses of cavalry. Napoleon gave him a command.

The choice of a major-general was all-important. Berthier had always occupied this post, to the satisfaction of the Emperor; he had been an admirable instrument. He did not remain long at Ghent, but left for Bamberg, where lived his uncle by marriage, the King of Bavaria; he was kept there as a sort of prisoner of the Allies. On the 1st of June, as a Russian regiment was passing before the castle on its way to France, Berthier was seen to leave a window on the first floor, to reappear at a window on the third floor, to fall from it on the pavement. His death was attributed to an accident; it was probably a suicide. Napoleon's choice for a major-general fell on Soult, who had never occupied the post. Napoleon wished to have it occupied by a Marshal of France. He left Davout in the Ministry of War. The commanders of the army corps were all able and experienced men. "Never," says M. Houssaye, "will the French army have such chiefs. All of them had made war for more than twenty years, and none of them was as much as fifty years old." Napoleon's age was forty-six years; Davout was forty-five, Soult forty-six, Ney forty-six, Grouchy forty-nine, Drouet d'Erlon forty-nine, Lobau forty-five, Lamarque forty-five, Kellermann forty-five, Reille forty-four, Vandamme forty-four, Rapp forty-three, Clausel forty-three, Suchet forty-three, Pajol forty-three, Gérard forty-two, Drouot forty-one, Exelmans forty. All these men, who had so often led their soldiers to victory, had no longer their old faith in the success of the French arms. They knew well what formidable armaments were preparing against the Emperor. Division reigned in the general staff; discipline suffered from the effect of a general suspicion; the soldiers believed only in the Emperor, they all wanted to be passed in review by him. They believed that they alone had brought Napoleon back to the Tuileries. The army of 1815, sensitive, undisciplined, distrusting its chiefs, troubled by the fear of treason, but ardent for vengeance, was capable of the most heroic efforts. "Never," says M. Houssaye, "did Napoleon have in his hand a more dangerous or more fragile weapon."

Napoleon had made his plan of campaign early, long before the breaking out of hostilities; it was based on that of the Allies, which was known to him. Six armies were to cross the French frontier—four from Maubeuge to Bâle; the three others by way of the Alps. Napoleon decided to concentrate an army of 150,000 men on the northern frontier, to fight separately the English and the Prussians, and then to deal with his other enemies. It was necessary for him to operate so as to hinder the junction of Wellington and Blücher. The Allies did not understand his movements of concentration. On the 15th of June, when Napoleon had already a foot in Belgium, Wellington wrote a long letter to the Czar, in which he said that he would assume the offensive at the end of the month. Blücher, a few days before, wrote to his wife from Namur: "We shall soon be in France. We might easily stay a year longer here, for Napoleon will not attack us." I will not follow M. Houssaye into all the particulars of the campaign. After Charleroi was taken, Napoleon and Ney had an interview. The Emperor told Ney to take command of the First and Second Corps, to follow the enemy on the road to Brussels, and to take position at a cross-road called Quatre-Bras. Ney, prudent for the first time in his life, took position only at some distance from Quatre-Bras; nevertheless, Napoleon had succeeded in establishing himself in the centre of the enemy's position.

After Byron, after Thackeray, M. Houssaye gives us a description of the eve of Waterloo at Brussels. He is rather severe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on Wellington. At the ball of the Duchess of Richmond, Wellington was very gay; he entered the room only towards midnight:

"This whole day, he obstinately kept his troops dispersed at four, eight, ten, fifteen leagues from each other; and his evening orders, by which he flattered himself to have repaired his grave fault, were pitiable. . . . If his orders had been executed, a gap of four leagues would have been opened between Nivelles and the Dyle, a gap through which Ney could have advanced half way to Brussels without firing a gun, or have fallen on the rear of the Prussian army and caused its utter destruction. . . . Fortunately for the Allies, some of the subordinates of Wellington took it upon themselves to act without awaiting his orders, and others intelligently disobeyed those which, after so much time lost, he decided to give."

I leave it to military judges to weigh the value of these remarks. M. Houssaye, on the other hand, defends the Emperor against the imputations of theoretical strategists like Charras (who wrote, during his exile under the Second Empire, a minute account of the battle of Waterloo), who denounce Napoleon's fatal indecision and torpor of mind during the campaign. Lord Wolseley has lately made similar criticisms; but, if we judge of Napoleon's state of mind by the incessant orders he gave during those momentous days, it is difficult to admit that his intelligence was impaired.

Wellington's and Blücher's meeting near the village of Brye must have been very impressive. It took place before the battle of Ligny, which ended in the defeat and retreat of the Prussian army. During the battle, Napoleon sent nine dispatches to Marshal Ney, with whose help he hoped to annihilate completely the army of Blücher, but Ney "was no more the same man," said Napoleon at St. Helena; he had become too prudent, and had neglected to occupy the position of Quatre-Bras; his divisions were dispersed, and when Napoleon himself determined to attack Quatre-Bras, he had to fight a real battle against Wellington. The battle was lost by him, or rather ended without any result, as in the evening the English and the French resumed nearly the same positions they had in the morning, with the difference only that the English were now in force in positions where before they had only detachments. When Wellington heard of the defeat of the Prussians at Ligny and their retreat on Wavre, he determined to occupy Mont-Saint-Jean, a strong defensive position, which he had studied the year before. He received news of Blücher on the night of the 17th to the 18th June at two o'clock in the morning, and, being assured of the coöperation of the Prussians, he resolved to accept the battle.

Napoleon dictated the same night his order of battle. All the details of the great struggle are known—the last review of the French troops, the dispositions for the attack, the storming of the farm of Hougoumont, the orders sent to Grouchy, who had 30,000 men under his command when the first Prussian columns appeared, the charges of D'Erlon, of the Somerset Guards, of the Ponsonby Dragoons, the two attacks on La-Haye-Sainte, the repeated charges of the French Cuirassiers, the storming of La-Haye-Sainte by the French infantry, the coming into line of Bülow, the last general attacks, the assault on the Mont-Saint-Jean by the Guard, the final defeat, the rout, and the confused retreat of the French army, followed by the Prussian cavalry. Napoleon had been warned before the battle by Gérard, who spoke to him of the tenacity of the British infantry. Instead of manœuvring and making flank movements, he wished to mark his victory by what he called a *coup de tonnerre;* he determined to concentrate on the English centre in its trenches a terrific artillery fire, and to break this centre so as to divide the English army in two, and to obtain a crushing and terrific victory. He did not reckon sufficiently with that "indomitable English courage," of which Macaulay speaks, which is never greater than in the evening of an undecided and murderous struggle.

The details of the French retreat given by M. Houssaye are appalling. The army had made too great an effort. All hope was given up, and the Prussian cavalry had too easy a task in following with merciless ardor the remnants of what was the last army of Napoleon.

Correspondence.

A PROTEST AND A PROPHECY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Like yourself, I should have preferred a real leader of men such as Thomas B. Reed in the White House, rather than McKinley, who parcels out not only his patronage, but all his functions, among Senators and Representatives, and who heeds clamor rather than the country's welfare. I would much rather have a man of whom a modern Ennius might sing:

". . . non posuit rumores ante salutem."

Like yourself, I cannot see any wisdom in paying $20,000,000 for an unfailing source of bloodshed, waste, and scandal. But on one point you wrong our President. You accuse him, every now and then, of doing this or that shabby thing to "get delegates," that is, to bring about his renomination. He is undoubtedly quite innocent of anything of this kind, for he knows already perfectly well that no other candidate will contest the Republican nomination with him. The party in power cannot put forward anybody else than the incumbent without admission of failure. Mr. McKinley will be nominated on the first ballot, receiving the vote of every delegate; and as the Democrats cannot, between now and November of next year, shake off Mr. Bryan and Sixteen-to-One, Mr. McKinley will be elected by a majority of over one hundred among the electors.

Current problems should be discussed in the light of this prospect.

Respectfully yours, D.

Louisville, Ky., April 10, 1899.

"AS OUR FATHERS DID."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It is the fashion of the Administration hack-writers to dismiss with scorn the assertion that the natives of the Philippines are heroically fighting for their liberties. But the race that has produced not only the able and much maligned Aguinaldo but also the great and lovable man of science and martyr, Rizal, has, in the course of its long history, proved time and again that it possesses that real love of liberty which gives birth to the nations of the world. To stigmatize the Tagals as "mere savages" may suit the ignorant and indifferent minds among us, but there is no denying the fact that their two months' struggle against the power of the United States is part and parcel of their century-long battle to be free, from Spain, from us, from all the races of men who have sought to make them less than they hoped to be. The story of their struggle with Spain is too glorious for the world ever to forget, and the necessities of the opportunist policy of the Administration cannot blind us to its significance. They were on the eve of victory when we came to destroy their dream of a home-land all their own. No cry of traitor can silence the unprejudiced historian who shall write the record of this brave and valiant people, nor can our flag ever replace the heart-born liberty it seems bound now to extinguish "in the name of humanity." Senator Hoar and his able supporters are not alone in comparing the struggle of the Filipinos with that which gave birth to our own republic. There is a notable tendency on the part of those who have had to do with the Tagals to compare them with our own patriots of old.

A writer in *Putnam's Magazine* (vol. viii., p. 144), thirty-three years ago, thus describes (the italics are mine) the battle of the 27th of April, 1521, in which Magellan fell:

"*The battle with the steel arms of Europe against the wooden arrows and lances of the islanders lasted many hours.* There was no flinching on either side. The courage of the Indian [*i. e.*, Filipino] was proof against the mail of the Spaniards; the latter, appealing to their foes' terror and *love of home*, set fire to their houses, and a village was in a blaze. But, *as our fathers in like case once did*, the brave natives fought with more determined fury; and, with but seven or eight survivors, the Spaniards, as the fight grew fiercer, fell step by step back to the shore."

Have the Filipinos changed in their love for liberty to-day? Hardly; they face the cannon, as their ancestors did the musket. Is it too late yet to "do justice and fear not"?

Alex. F. Chamberlain.

Worcester, Mass., April 11, 1899.

EXPATRIATION.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The opinion of Secretary Day concerning forfeiture of citizenship, against which a correspondent protests in the *Nation* of the 6th inst., seems not materially to differ from the opinions of his predecessors in office, as quoted in Wharton's Digest, vol. 2, p. 446, and following.

Daniel Webster's opinion was that "a person found residing in a foreign country is presumed to be there with the purpose of remaining; and, to relieve himself of the character which this presumption fixes upon him, he must show that his residence was only temporary, and accompanied all the time with a fixed and definite intention of returning. If in that country he engages in trade and business, he is considered by the law of nations as a merchant of that country; nor is the presumption rebutted by the residence of his wife and family in the country from which he came. This is the doctrine as laid down by the United States courts."

"Citizenship," says Mr. Fish, "involves duties and obligations as well as rights. The correlative right of protection by the Government may be waived or lost by long-continued avoidance and silent withdrawal from the duties of citizenship as well as by open renunciation."

The opinions quoted from Secretaries Mar-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cy, Seward, and Evarts are in harmony with the foregoing. J.

FORT WAYNE, IND., April 8, 1899.

DISARMAMENT AND PANSLAVISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of November 3, 1887, you printed an interesting letter from Theodore von Bunsen on "International Peace," disarmament, and arbitration. The whole letter is worth rereading, but one sentence in particular has a peculiar point just now: "To my mind, the great approaching war with Panslavism must be fought before a reduction of European armaments by mutual consent can be brought before a conference of the Powers." W. H. B.

ATHENS, GA., April 10, 1899.

[Bunsen's prevision has been falsified by the Czar of the Slavs taking the initiative. The conference will be held, and reduction brought before it.—ED. NATION.]

SINCERE GOOD CATHOLICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Perhaps an astute Pope of Rome, dealing with "good American" Catholics, might be able somewhat to harmonize matters—if I've rightly divined what a good American and a presumed bad American Catholic may be—by following the course prescribed by Clement IX., as laid down in Voltaire's 'Siècle de Louis XIV.', ch. xxxii., page 435, upon the subject of Jansenism:

'Rospigliosi, devenu pape sous le nom de Clément IX., pacifia tout pour quelque temps. Il engagea les quatre évêques à signer *sincèrement* le formulaire, au lieu de *purement* et *simplement*."

If the "good American" branch would only be *sincere* instead of *pure* and *simple*, and would just accept things that way, it would accommodate the Holy See, and probably everybody else would be satisfied.

H. M. DOAK.

NASHVILLE, TENN., April 11, 1899.

A CORRECTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me space to correct a mistake which I made in the recent annual report of this museum, in describing one of the more important Greek vases acquired last year? The vase in question (page 68, No. 41) bears the signature of Hieron together with the name of his father. This name appears in the genitive — Μέδοντος — and I said it should have been Μείδοντος. My statement was an error, the spelling was correct, and the name is Medon, not Meidon. As this is the first instance in which the name of Hieron's father has appeared, the matter is not without importance to students of Greek vases, and I make the correction here in the hope that it may reach as many as possible of those who are interested in the subject.

Very respectfully yours,

EDWARD ROBINSON.

MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS,
BOSTON, April 13, 1899.

AUDITORIUMS AND ORATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial "Changes in Oratory" I do not find enumerated among the causes of decline the struggle with the hall, as depicted in an address by a specialist, Dr. Ephraim Cutter, "to the section on laryncology and otology, at the forty-ninth annual meeting of the American Medical Association, held at Denver, Col., June 7-10, 1898." He considers it a humane undertaking on the part of the doctors to call attention to the auditorium indisposition and the remedy for the disorder. The ailment in part is due to the architect and also to the speaker. The former, nine times in ten, has in view the auditor's eye rather than his ear, ornamentation rather than phonation. An instance, among countless ones, is that of the Albert Memorial Town Hall, at Leeds, with its "magnificent walls and pillars of polished variegated marbles." Though a "general visibility of the platform to the whole audience" is not neglected, under the prevailing conditions of intelligence among orators this hall encloses a space which the human voice fills with inarticulate echoes, and where the would-be hearers strain ineffectually for what is addressed to their intelligence. To cite a case in America, the hall in Saratoga is of bad repute for hearing.

To the architect the lecturer urges two ways of getting at the remedy: (1.) The concrete. Take auditoriums, he advises, which are easy to sing and speak in, and he instances that of the First Congregational Church in Woburn, Mass., which the architect, the late John Stevens of Boston, "wanted to be his monument. He certainly favored the ear and eye both. There is not a seat of the fifteen hundred but commands a perfect hearing and view of the preacher or speaker at the pulpit." A well-known elocutionist "pronounced it to be the best auditorium for phonation he ever met with. Clergymen have testified to the same; singers also." "Major Ambrose Bancroft, master carpenter, Woburn, has given me [the lecturer] the following dimensions of the auditorium: Height of ceiling from floor, 34 feet 10 inches; width, 80 feet; length, 150 feet; width of side galleries, 11 feet; width of rear galleries, 14 feet." The keynote of this auditorium is F. Another example is "the chapel of the New York city Church of the Comforter." "The auditorium is 25x50 feet, open to the roof; height of ridge-pole, 18 feet." (2.) The ideal. "Study the nodes of the key of F, for example, and have the walls and height correspond to them." Sound the keynote; then, "walking in the direction of the long diameter of the auditorium, note when the tone is loudest and weakest." In the Woburn church the node of the keynote is about fifteen feet.

W. W. TUFTS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 16, 1899.

Notes.

The well-known English writer Major G. J. Younghusband joins the throng who compose books on the seat of what Senator Hoar aptly calls our present "civil war" in the East. He landed in Dewey and Merritt's wake, and 'The Philippine Islands and Round About' is the result, to be published directly by Macmillan & Co. They also promise without delay 'The Making of Hawaii,' by Prof. William Fremont Blackman of Yale.

Miss Hamm's portrait, in her 'Porto Rico and the West Indies' (F. Tennyson Neely), indicates a person not to be trifled with in the pursuit of knowledge. We have already noticed her work on the Philippines. The present is also the result of visits to the scene of observation, and possesses a like interest, conveyed (with the aid of many illustrations) in the same newspaper English. To make a thick volume, she has had to resort to historical compilation, and is most to be trusted in matters obviously within the range of her observation—climate, manners and customs, the status of women, cookery, products, trade and transportation, and the like. She finds it necessary, for the political development of the island, that our district system should be speedily introduced and adopted. "This simple and efficient machinery is unknown to Spanish history." But Miss Hamm has a wholesome dread of "the adventurer and the carpet-bagger."

Another book for the day, from the same firm, is an oblong collection of half-tone war portraits and views in the West Indies and the Philippines, under the title, 'Greater America.' The only text is in the legends. No doubt these photographic memoranda will have their value as time goes on; but their number is legion.

In line with the foregoing is 'The Spanish-American War: The Events of the War Described by Eye-Witnesses' (Chicago: Herbert S. Stone & Co.), consisting of chapters from the war correspondence of leading American journals. The narrative shifts from the East to the West Indies in a carefully prepared chronological sequence, the date being given in the running-title. For this reason, and because of the illustrations, the compilation will be found convenient to refer to.

"A ready reference-book of facts and figures, historical, geographical, and commercial, about Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Hawaii, and Guam," is the self-definition, well justified, of the 'American Colonial Handbook,' edited by Thomas Campbell Copeland, and others (Funk & Wagnalls Co.). It is in the form of a catechism, preceded by a synopsis of the treaty of peace, and in the case of each division by an historical sketch. Authorities are duly marshalled at the end. Each section has a map. A parallel index binds all together. The little volume, with rounded corners, slips easily into the pocket.

Prof. A. G. Cameron's 'Selections from Edmond and Jules de Goncourt' (American Book Company) is a decided success, if the aim of the book be, as we suppose it is, to stimulate and enable the reader to choose intelligently, for more extensive reading, from among the numerous works of the Goncourts those most to his taste; for the selections, while too short to be of much interest in themselves, are sufficient, in connection with the analyses of the "Introduction," to give an idea of the style and character of the writings from which they are taken. The introduction, notes, list of critiques, and appendixes, bear proof of great industry and genuine interest in the lives and works of the remarkable pair of brothers. If there were no other sign of the editor's diligent study of his subject, it would certainly be found in the originality and eccentricities of his own style, so plainly affected by the style—or shall we say the variant styles?—of the two Frenchmen. We remark that Renan's name is spelled with the acute accent every time it occurs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In No. 119 of the "Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études," M. Gabriel Monod begins what promises to be the best critical introduction in existence to the sources of the Carolingian period, in continuation of similar studies of the Merovingian sources in the same series. In this first part he is concerned with the Carolingian annals to 829, dealing mainly with their dependence upon one another, and their sources of information. M. Monod considers all the important theories of his predecessors in the same field, furnishing a most useful guide to the literature of the subject, and gives, though never at great length, the results of his own studies, which are characterized by all his well-known moderation and sound common sense. Of 175 pages, 60 are given to the great 'Annales Laurissenses majores,' and 60 to two introductory chapters, which will be found of general interest, one on the general characteristics of the Carolingian historiography, and the other on the Carolingian renaissance. Perhaps M. Monod's most interesting suggestion is that the common features of the annals may be due not to their dependence on the work of some predecessor, but to their borrowing from a kind of circular letter which he supposes may have been sent out to inform the annalists of important events.

Several years ago, Prof. Du Bois-Reymond of the University of Berlin published a discussion of the principles of art from a physiological point of view, in which he maintained that the delineations of centaurs and other monsters, whose organisms violate the laws of nature and can therefore have no real existence, are mythopoetic aberrations of the fancy, in which the modern artist should not indulge. Of the same general character is 'Die Schönheit des weiblichen Körpers,' recently issued by the Stuttgart publisher, Ferdinand Encke. The author, Dr. C. H. Stratz, is a physiologist and physician, and points out some curious pathognomonic symptoms in types of female beauty in famous works of art. Thus, according to his diagnosis, the celebrated Venus of Botticelli in the Uffizi at Florence shows unmistakable signs of consumption, and ought not to be sailing naked in an open shell across the sea. A modern example of the same kind is furnished by Franz Stuck's "Expulsion from Paradise," exhibited at Munich in 1891, in which peculiarly crooked limbs, enlarged joints, and depressed ribs of our common mother indicate that she had suffered severely from rickets in her childhood. Still another instance cited is the Aphrodite in Klein's "Judgment of Paris," whose bodily formation proves that rachitis must have prevailed in the abode of the Grecian deities as well as in Eden before the fall. Our author thinks the only remedy for such lapses is for artists to study pathology as well as anatomy. He also gives some sensible advice to women concerning the cultivation of beauty on hygienic principles.

Ludwig Günther of Stettin publishes a German translation of Kepler's 'Somnium,' a study of how astronomy would appear upon the moon (Leipzig: Teubner). The name of Günther (probably identical in origin with Gonthier, the family name of the Schwartzburgs) is already represented in science half-a-dozen times over, without counting the English Edmund Gunter. We are glad to make a new acquaintance worthy of the family. Prof. Sigismund Günther of Munich is a learned and delightful writer on the history of the mathematical sciences. He has sometimes been accused of too great originality, but Herr Ludwig altogether surpasses him in a title-page which is "ein genaues Faksimile" of the original edition of the 'Somnium,' except that it is somewhat reduced, and except that it is translated from Latin into German! If the volume had no other interest, it would be worth getting for a remarkable portrait of Kepler, looking much more mathematical and less witty than Nordling's, which, however, Kepler himself said was not a good likeness. That is beetle-browed; this has a low, retreating forehead. The nose, cheeks, and hair leave no doubt that this really is Kepler, and it is impossible to resist the conviction that it is a likeness. It is dated 1610, the year after the publication of the 'De motibus stellae Martis,' when Kepler was in Prague.

The brood of daintily printed literary and semi-political journals which came into being like so many butterflies a few years ago in this country, has, in spite of some failures, been reinforced of late. Such is *In Lantern-Land*, a monthly quarto, edited at Hartford, Conn., by Charles Dexter Allen, author of a well-known work on 'American Bookplates.' The fifth number, for April 1, contains a book-plate on a separate supplementary leaf. It comments on current topics, reviews books, deals with current fine art and the drama, and has at least the merit of serious intent. Another venture, *La Crême* (Boston: Charles E. Brown & Co.), is a 16mo in paper covers, each issue containing a single story. The first, for March 31, gives Kipling's "My Lord the Elephant," plus his "Recessional" and "Vampire."

The principal article in the *National Geographic Magazine* (Washington) for April is an account, by W. D. Wilcox, of two expeditions, in 1896 and 1898, to the sources of the Saskatchewan. Considerable danger was experienced in the first from an extensive forest fire, and in the second, which was in October, from the snow which fell on thirteen of the seventeen days in which the explorer was out. The scenery, of which several fine illustrations are given, is "remarkably grand, and unfailing in variety of mountain forms so long as the valleys are the point of view"; but from high summits it is somewhat monotonous on account of the uniformity in height of the thousands of mountains visible. The forests which clothe them up to 7,000 feet "are chiefly of Engelmann's spruce and balsam fir, with occasional areas of jack pine." Mr. Wilcox attributes no small measure of his success to the splendid qualities of his pack-horses. An interesting note is communicated by Mr. W. H. Dall on a harpoon-head obtained from a whale in Bering Sea which may have carried it at least thirty-six years. It bore the private marks of the *Montezuma*, once a British man-of-war, then a New Bedford whaler, and finally one of the "stone fleet" sunk in Charleston harbor during the Civil War.

The *Annales de Géographie* for March contains the introductory lecture of Prof. Vidal de la Blache of the University of Paris on the physical geography of France. Among the other articles is an historical sketch of the colonization of the provinces of Ufa and Orenburg in Eastern Russia, and an account of the Jewish and German agricultural colonies in Palestine. There are fourteen of the former, with 4,220 inhabitants, who have not succeeded yet as farmers, but make excellent gardeners and cultivators of the grape. Their wine sells in the European markets for four times as much as that made by the Germans. These number 1,500, all but 400 of whom are of the sect of the Templars, founded in 1868. They support themselves by both farming and grape-growing, and by pursuing various trades. The rector of the Jesuit College near Shanghai contributes a short note on the recent geographical and other scientific work of his society in China. These include explorations of the Yangtse River, collections of natural history, meteorological and astronomical observations, and the preparation of a "Chinese encyclopædia, accepted officially by the Government, for the scientific education of young China [*la jeune Chine*]."

The principal topics treated in *Petermann's Mitteilungen*, No. 2, are the geology of southwestern Hayti, and the Siberian district of Anadyr in extremest northeastern Asia. The products of Anadyr include coal and probably sulphur. Its Russian inhabitants number about 500, and have a high character for industry, temperance, morality, peaceableness, and "an ideal honesty." They are profoundly melancholy, however; social pleasures, sports, dancing, and singing, being unknown among them. There are also shorter notices of the Nicaragua and Panama Canals, of the changes on the Netherland coast in 1897, and of the distribution of Danes and Germans in northern Schleswig, with a map. In supplemental No. 127 Dr. Carl Sapper treats of the geology, hydrography, orography, and surface soil of northern Central America, the result of observations made during the years 1888-1897. Three large maps and twenty-five geological profiles accompany the paper.

The special features of the April Bulletin of the Boston Public Library are lists of books and documents added to the statistical department, and of works relating to baths, gymnasia, and the labor movement in England and America. The additions to the Brown musical library and to the Garrison collection of anti-slavery MSS. are also noteworthy.

The twenty-third annual report of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts shows that the year 1898 was one of great prosperity for that institution. Bequests aggregating over a million dollars are recorded, and there is evidence of gratifying growth in every department included in the museum. It is in the field of ancient art that the acquisitions of the year have been most extensive. The report of the curator of classical antiquities fills seventy-six pages, and deals with nearly four hundred objects, chiefly original specimens of the minor arts of ancient Greece and Italy—small bronzes, engraved gems, articles of jewelry, painted vases, and the like. Not less noteworthy than the extent of these acquisitions is their high quality. Such a record is without a parallel in this country, and Boston is yearly exercising, by virtue of the policy of its museum, a more and more potent attraction upon American students and lovers of Greek art.

Tommaso Corsini, President of the "Association for the Protection of Ancient Florence," has recently been presented with a written address, congratulating him on the success already attending the efforts of his society, but urging yet greater earnestness in the accomplishment of its purpose. To this paper are affixed ten thousand signatures, among which are the names of princes, a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York bishop, and prominent representatives of historic, social, artistic, and ecclesiastical circles of Europe. Complimented by this general expression of interest, but piqued by the accusation which it implies of their own indifference, the Florentines deny the destruction of historic buildings through so-termed "improvements," and recall the fact that, a few years since, they abandoned a project for broadening a certain street because it involved the sacrifice of an ancient shrine and an old city gate. Is not this proof enough, they ask, that the modernizing of Florence will not be at the expense of her historic monuments?

The Société des Amis de l'Université de Paris, which was organized some months ago, has issued a public announcement of its purpose and method. Its general object is to advance the interests of the University of Paris, and its first object will be to look after the welfare of the students; but the maintenance of dormitories and the offer of financial aid to the needy, with help in the way of tutoring and coaching, are also in view. Quite naturally the Society will also offer special prizes for proficiency, a method much more popular in France than in any other country. It is generally understood that it will devote special attention to foreigners.

Recently a few medical students of the University of Halle began a campaign against the admission of women to the courses of clinical instruction in that institution, declaring that their presence produced unpleasant situations and was extremely painful to modest young men. They even went so far as to post their protest on the blackboard of the University of Berlin, in order to gain adherents to their views in other academical circles and to strengthen their position by a general agitation of the subject. This step on the part of undergraduates was resented by the medical faculty of Halle as an impertinence, and called forth a sharp reply, emphatically denying the truth of the statements made by the students, and attributing them partly to ignorance of the facts and partly to wilful misrepresentation. The professors assert that the presence of women in the lecture-rooms and the clinical hospitals has not had the slightest injurious moral effect, nor diminished in the least the earnestness with which the studies are pursued. They express their deep sorrow at the animosity shown by these students towards their female colleagues, for which there is no ground whatever. The faculty, it is added, would feel justified in disciplining the authors of the protest, were it not for the conviction that it had been made without due consideration of its nature and scope. In conclusion, the hope is expressed that the more thoughtful members of the clinic will disapprove of the regrettable action of their fellows, and that nothing more will occur to disturb the cordial relations hitherto existing between professors and students.

—The Massachusetts Historical Society has just removed from its home on the slope of Beacon Hill, Boston (within a biscuit throw of the site of its foundation in 1791), to the border of the Fenway, the landscape gardener's reclamation of the old-time estuary called the Back Bay. This event was made the occasion by the President, Mr. Charles Francis Adams, of a deferred inaugural address long beyond precedent and equally interesting, delivered at the new rooms on Thursday last before a select audience of which it was noticeable that ladies composed about a third. Himself a skilled writer of history and biography, Mr. Adams spoke to a large number of active and eminent cultivators of both these branches regarding the modification of the historian's aim and method induced by the publication of the 'Origin of Species'; and the corresponding change in the function of historical societies. Macaulay's and Bancroft's histories were chosen as types of works at once over-long and fragmentary, and, from the Darwinian point of view, unphilosophical. Their great successors hereafter are to be, not men of research among the sources, but builders on the monograph; and the main object of the historical society should be to facilitate knowledge and use of its collections by the patient specialists whose quintessence the evolutionary historiographer will pack away in four volumes like Green in his 'History of the English People,' or in one like Goldwin Smith's 'History of the United States.'

—Mr. Adams would not have been himself if he had not enlivened his discourse with much humor and many striking observations, such as his summing up the bloody battles of Antietam and Gettysburg as meaning, for his own personal participation in them, a couple of refreshing naps on the field. And again, he had ascertained that, "In the case of one public library in a considerable Massachusetts city," the copy of Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall' had, "in thirty years, not once been consecutively read through by a single individual." The orator quoted Darwin's approval, as not exaggerated, of a German opinion that "all other series of events—as that which resulted in the culture of mind in Greece, and that which resulted in the empire of Rome—only appear to have purpose and value when viewed in connection with, or rather as subsidiary to, . . . the great stream of Anglo-Saxon emigration to the west"—which Mr. Adams translates into the voyage of the *Mayflower* and the founding of Boston. The Massachusetts Historical Society, we remark in closing, is the oldest in America. It would be interesting to know if Mr. Adams's "possibly the first [to be organized] in the world" is also among its titles to distinction.

—The fifty-seventh and fifty-eighth volumes of the 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan) carry this great work fairly into the letter W, so that it "smells land," in the Suffolk phrase. As our readers are well aware, many foreigners find commemoration here whose lives were associated with England, and one meets with such contrasts as, on opposite pages, Sir Robert Richard Torrens (1814-1884), author of the Australian land-title act that bears his name and is now invading this country in the wake of the Australian ballot, and Pietro Torrigiano (1472-1522), who smashed the nose of his fellow-art student Michelangelo. Very interesting is the sketch of Mme. Tussaud, whose London wax exhibition is now the property of a company, yet employs as its modeller her great-grandson. Probably the world cannot produce a similar show which has been (in France and in England) open to the public for money since 1770. Another kind of distinction was won across the Channel by Polydore Vergil, the historian; and still another by Van Dyck. Turner is the next most distinguished artist in this tract of the Dictionary, his not unfriendly biographer making the admission that "his private life was sordid and sensual." A peculiar æsthetic sensibility was owned by Wainewright, the poisoner, who extenuated his dispatching of Helen Abercromby on the ground "that she had very thick ankles." Edward Vernon, the elder admiral (1684-1757), it was who first watered the rum dealt out to seamen, the unwelcome official mixture being called by them "grog," "which is said to have been Vernon's nickname in the squadron—derived, it is said, from his having a grogram boat-cloak." The Oxford Dictionary will presently pass upon this *on-dit* etymology. Vernon's change of the dram in strength and in regularity of service is pronounced to have been "perhaps the greatest improvement to discipline and efficiency ever produced by one stroke of the pen"; but the stroke which in our day abolished grog altogether in the navy has at least an equal claim to that laurel. Capt. John Underhill of Pequot War fame; Sir Harry Vane; William Vassall of Plymouth; Vancouver; and Mrs. Trollope are among the lives which touch America nearly. In Mrs. Trollope's case the marvel is that she began writing at fifty-two, and scored a great success at once even if she lost caste in the country whose ruder manners she could not overlook nor refrain from depicting. Her biographer taxes her generally with an eye for coarseness; but her 'Domestic Manners of the Americans' was not therefore a coarse book. That, and Miss Martineau's 'Society in America,' have, for intellectual vigor, yet to be rivalled by the observations of any travellers of their sex in any country.

—'The French Revolution and English Poets' (Henry Holt & Co.) is the title of a Harvard dissertation by A. E. Hancock. It was unfortunate for the author that no less an authority than Prof. Dowden should have forestalled him—not in date of composition, but of publication—in the same field. Mr. Dowden's lectures on 'The French Revolution and English Literature,' delivered at the Princeton celebration, were reviewed in these columns on their appearance in print. Their author, as his title implies, covered a wider field than does Mr. Hancock, who gives a less detailed treatment of Godwin and Day, and omits mention of Landor in the character of a disciple of revolution. On the other hand, Mr. Hancock points out the influence of Helvetius and Holbach on Godwin and Shelley, and of Rousseau on Byron. Wordsworth and Coleridge, disappointed and disillusioned by the excesses of the Revolution, experienced a reaction, and together sought consolation in Nature.

"Abandoned of Heaven! mad avarice thy guide
. . . . . .
O Albion! thy predestined ruins rise!"

So wrote Coleridge at the crisis of his revolutionary fervor. It is amusing to find him a little later addressing that same Albion as:

"Thou Queen! Thou Delegated Deity of Earth."

But that was when he had recovered his patriotism by means of a brief exile in Germany. Byron and Shelley, who were less critical and more genuinely in love with individualism in all its aspects, never performed this *volte-face*. Style is not Mr. Hancock's strongest point. We have found the shortness and jerkiness of his sentences a decided drawback to the pleasure of reading this praiseworthy little study. A bibliography would have greatly increased the value of the book.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—The work of editing Juvenal has been done, once and for all, by Mayor, but his famous edition does not at present include the Sixth Satire, though we understand that his notes on it are collected in readiness for publication. Moreover, Mayor's commentary is somewhat overweighted with illustrative matter, so that it is used in this country, at any rate, rather as a book of reference than as a text-book. The new edition of the 'Satires,' by Mr. J. D. Duff of Trinity College (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan), is doubly welcome. The scholarship of the editor of Munro's 'Lucretius' is peculiarly accurate and unpedantic; he combines a close knowledge of his period with a neat gift for pointing out modern parallelisms—an exercise that calls for the utmost discretion and tact, if it is not to cheapen and mislead. Mr. Duff's enterprise in including the Sixth Satire makes his edition especially valuable. He has selected for commentary no less than 530 out of the 661 lines of this brilliant and neglected composition. "Satires III. and X. are prostituted by parliamentary and vulgar use, and should lie by for a while," wrote Fitz-Gerald. They have certainly received undue prominence at the expense of the "Legend of Bad Women." The Sixth Satire, which is Juvenal's longest and most epigrammatic, contains his advice to one about to marry to choose some quicker form of suicide: "Who would marry when he could buy a rope and hang himself?" The scathing pictures of the athletic woman and of the woman who knows Greek—"Give me a wife who doesn't know Greek," said Martial, about this time—the studies of life in a large city corrupted by foreign influences, read with amazing verisimilitude after the lapse of eighteen centuries. Mr. Duff's commentary is lively as well as scholarly. On the whole, his is an edition that should replace all others than Mayor's for general use in schools and colleges, and, as we have indicated, in the matter of the Sixth Satire, it supplies Mayor's omissions.

LORD HALIFAX—THE STATESMAN.

The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart., First Marquis of Halifax, etc. With a new edition of his works, now for the first time collected and revised. By H. C. Foxcroft. 2 vols. Longmans, Green & Co. 1898.

Every one agrees that George Savile, First Marquis of Halifax, merits a biography; the eulogies of Hume, of Ranke, of Mackintosh and Macaulay, are more than sufficient to vindicate his title to fame. Every judicious reader of Mr. Foxcroft's meritorious volumes must admit that Halifax has not yet received the monument he deserves, for the present 'Life and Letters' is, indeed, the material for a biography, but is no more a biography than a huge heap of bricks and a lot of mortar are a house. Meanwhile, a critic who acquiesces in the claim of Halifax to posthumous reputation may feel some difficulty in answering the following question: Wherein precisely consists the greatness of Halifax?

The inquiry is one to which it is not at first sight quite easy to find a reply. Halifax cannot be numbered among the heroes of the English nation. He had about him nothing heroic. His caution and his timidity, to use no harsher term, were as obvious as his prudence and sagacity. He does not belong to the same class as Hampden, or Cromwell, or William III., or Strafford, or Laud. The names of these men even now excite vehement admiration or virulent hatred; they all exhibit an element of greatness; they are the progressive or reactionary statesmen of a Revolutionary era—this holds good even of Laud, though he remained to the end of his life a sort of glorified Don, whom the freak of fortune removed from the headship of St. John's College to the Archbishopric of Canterbury at a crisis in English history when an archbishop needed the genius of a statesman. But the name of Halifax can at the present day kindle *no strong emotion. You can eulogize his* virtues and show that they more than balanced his defects; yet an admirer can judge Halifax with calmness, and admit that he did not rank among the highest class of statesmen.

He was, further, in no way the centre of English politics. He played a remarkable and for one moment (when he insured the rejection of the Exclusion Bill) a splendid part, but he was never the leader of the nation. Men far inferior to him, intellectually and morally, were the leading actors on the public stage. The reputation of Sidney and of Russell, and the fame or the infamy of Shaftesbury, have impressed themselves on popular imagination. The name of Halifax would be—most unjustly, we admit—forgotten were it not for the sympathetic criticism which he has received from men of letters. He is a good deal better known to historians than to history.

Can it, again, be asserted that the statesmanship of Halifax was vindicated by extraordinary success or wisdom? Macaulay seems to answer this inquiry with a decided affirmative, and, were his reply unfaltering, the present writer at least would yield to the authority of the great historian. But Macaulay's language is indecisive: "What distinguishes [Halifax] from all other English statesmen is this, that through a long public life, and through frequent and violent revolution of public feeling, he *almost* invariably took that view of the great questions of his time which history has finally adopted." The "almost" which we have underlined is, in the mouth of a writer not much given to qualifications, preëminently significant. Macaulay's love of truth, which, despite the strength of certain prejudices, was his most marked characteristic, prevented his bestowing upon a statesman whom he profoundly admired the complete eulogy with which the historian wished to close his account of his hero. That Halifax was sagacious in noting the flow and ebb of opinion, and that the coolness of his intellect, no less than the moderation of his passions, preserved him from the errors of enthusiasm or fanaticism, is certain; but that, on the Whig view (which, we may add, is in the main the true view) of the times in which Halifax lived, he made, in matters of judgment, tremendous mistakes, is certain.

It is, for instance, certainly arguable that the rejection of the Exclusion Bill was a blunder. The whole of James's subsequent career shows that he could not be trusted with power. It suggests, if it does not positively prove, that towards the end of the seventeenth century a sincere and ardent Roman Catholic could not with safety to the commonwealth be King of England. Unless this be true, the whole policy of the Whigs, and the Revolution of 1688 itself, were blunders. But if it be true, as Macaulay certainly believed, and with reason, that the safety of the nation was imperilled by allowing James to mount the throne; if it be true, as all the Whigs and many Englishmen who were not Whigs believed, as indeed many of them still believe, that the existence of a Roman Catholic dynasty must be found incompatible with the maintenance of English liberties and English Protestantism, what course was dictated by wisdom except the exclusion of James from succession to the crown? "The Exclusion Bill," it will be said, "was rejected and English liberty was saved." The reply to this argument is obvious; it is given by every page in Macaulay's History. English liberties were placed in deadly peril. It was the folly of James and the energy of William, not the foresight or the wisdom of Halifax, which saved them from destruction.

But the case against Halifax, as regards the Exclusion Bill, is stronger than at first sight appears. There was a great deal to be said for preventing James's accession to the crown; there was something to be said for allowing James to inherit the ordinary rights and responsibilities of an English king. The policy which was rejected by the nation would, as we now know, have averted the peril of despotism and the necessity for a revolution, but would probably have rekindled civil war. The course which was adopted by the nation at any rate postponed civil conflict, and might possibly, had James exhibited common prudence, have been ultimately found compatible with the maintenance or the foundation of Parliamentary government. But a third policy was conceivable which, while seeking to avoid, in reality combined, the disadvantages both of rejecting and of passing the Exclusion Bill. It consisted in limiting beforehand, by act of Parliament, the authority of James when he should become King, and then allowing him to take the crown as little more than a nominal monarch. But this was the policy of Halifax. "He assured me," says Burnet, "that any limitations whatsoever that should leave the title of King to the Duke might be obtained of the King, but that he was positive against the exclusion"; and Halifax, when he induced the House of Lords to reject the Exclusion Bill, seems to have expressed his confidence in his own capacity to supersede the Exclusion Bill by a practical scheme of limitations (p. 217). This policy of limitations, characteristic as it is of Halifax's intellect, assuredly bears failure on its face. It might for a moment have averted civil war, but it insured a violent political conflict on the death of Charles the Second. No wonder that, to use the expressions of Mr. Foxcroft, James entertained "a mortal hatred" for the limitation project, even as contrasted with the Bill of Exclusion. The wonder is that any one could have supposed that James as King would have loyally respected a law which he detested as Duke of York. If Halifax had any real belief in any plan of limitations, he took a view of the situation utterly different from any view finally adopted by history.

Was, again, Halifax right or wrong in declining to join in inviting the Prince of Orange to invade England? The question is a crucial one. If Halifax was right, the Whig leaders were wrong. But, to speak plainly, there is no single point on which the policy of the Whig leaders has been more emphatically justified by the event.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Revolution of 1688 was the most successful revolution on record. If events had progressed as might have been expected—that is, if either William or Anne had left descendants—the English Constitution would have been saved without the evils, which were undoubtedly considerable, of keeping a foreign and unpopular dynasty upon the throne; and the evils flowing from the accession of the House of Hanover were, after all, trifling. It is of course possible that Halifax's courage rather than his wisdom was at fault, and that his refusal to join the Whig Lords arose from the desire to save his own head, rather than from a wish to avert evil from the country. But this suspicion, though natural, is unjust. The intervention of foreigners is an incalculable evil. There is nothing discreditable in hesitation to invite the invasion of a Dutch Prince at the head of a Dutch army. But the statesmen who declined to invite William did not anticipate the verdict of history. Fanaticism has occasionally true previsions denied to statesmanlike prudence.

If, then, Halifax was not the leading English statesman of his age, and was not gifted with the foresight which invariably discerned the true path of political progress, what are the qualities which have enlisted the admiration of the foremost among historians, and well entitle him to a fame which he has hardly as yet acquired among the majority of Englishmen? The answer is, that Halifax was the earliest of really parliamentary statesmen. He was also the first in rank, if not in date, of English political pamphleteers.

As you read his Life, and still more as you read his writings, which are, at the present day, far more noteworthy than his statesmanship, you feel that you have passed into a quite modern age. At Halifax's birth, 1633, the civil wars had not begun. At his death, 1695, not forty years had passed since the close of the Protectorate. Englishmen of to-day are as far removed from the times of Palmerston as was Halifax at his death from the age of Cromwell; yet Halifax distinctly belongs in policy, in feeling, and in thought to the England, not of the seventeenth, but of the eighteenth, and even of the nineteenth century. He exhibits the moderation and the eloquence of the best Parliamentary statesmen; he already watches public opinion after the manner of an experienced Parliamentary hand. He hates violence. He trusts in trimming, or, to exchange the political slang of his day for the political slang of our own time, he is an Opportunist. We cannot conceive of his taking part in a meeting of Independents where prayer was intermingled with politics. He resented, no doubt honestly, the accusation of atheism. His Christianity, such as it was, had no connection with his public life, and was a very cool specimen of the rather chilly "rational piety" so dear to the Whigs. Sydney Smith would have been a divine exactly after the heart of Halifax. Halifax came into the world fifty years, or a century, too early—he belonged to a later age; he would have found his proper place in any Liberal and aristocratic cabinet from the time of the elder Pitt to the time of Palmerston, and this anticipation of the failings and the virtues of later times runs through his literary no less than his political achievements. He is the greatest of that long and splendid line of English pamphleteers which is at last, it may be feared, coming to an end. It is still, indeed, represented by one writer as public-spirited as he is brilliant, but it would be difficult to find, either in England or in the United States, any other representative of the school whereof one may call Halifax the founder. Nor was it only in his political pamphlets that he opened and marked out the path of English literature. His 'Advice to a Daughter' sets forth what is called the philosophy of life in the language of the men of the world, and gives to very practical counsels the additional interest of a slight intellectual flavor. It is the model which has been followed down even to the present day by English essayists.

But the writings of Halifax deserve separate treatment. What ought, on this occasion, to be noted is, that Halifax combined the characters of the statesman, the pamphleteer, and the practical moralist. It is the union of qualities, all remarkable in themselves, and all in a special sense belonging to the men of a later age, which is the true foundation of the fame of Halifax. It is this combination which gained the admiration, we might say the affection, of Macaulay. Mr. Foxcroft, after the fashion of the present day—a fashion, we are well assured, as transitory as it is unreasonable—is apologetic for acknowledging any virtue in Macaulay, and marvels at "a display of imaginative insight rarely evinced by the great Whig historian." Never was wonder more misplaced. How could the calm statesmanship and the literary gifts of Halifax fail to charm the last Englishman who has been at once a leading statesman and a great man of letters?

Spain; Its Greatness and Decay (1479-1788). By Martin A. S. Hume. With an Introduction by Edward Armstrong. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan. 1898.

This sketch of Spanish history, which fills a place in the Cambridge Historical Series, is very distinctly defined, so far as its chronological limits are concerned. Measured by reigns, it extends from Ferdinand and Isabella to Charles III.; and by great landmarks in political development, from the union of the two chief Iberian kingdoms to the French Revolution. During almost the whole of these three hundred years, Spain was either the leading Continental Power or a state in the first class. Of course her military prestige waned during the Thirty Years' War, but even under the later Hapsburgs she had armaments on both elements, and at the worst she never dropped out of the reckoning altogether. However weak she might be inherently, she took a hand in current contests, often painting her lath to resemble iron, but never being wholly destitute of forces that knew how to die. The state of chronic feebleness and revolution which has been her fatal characteristic within recent memory, dates from the death of Charles III., and does not therefore come within the range of the present narrative.

This volume represents a divided labor, in which the larger portion falls to the share of Major Hume. Mr. Armstrong's introduction, however, is much more than a word of preface. As regards scale, it is almost in due proportion with what follows, and seems to have been written that Major Hume might begin at his favorite period, the second half of the sixteenth century. The interval between Ferdinand and Philip II. Mr. Armstrong divides into three sections, the first closing at the death of Isabella and the second at the peace of Cambray. The one point upon which, as it appears to us, he most strikingly insists is the tendency of Charles V. to become more and more a Spaniard in sympathy and political disposition. He dwells upon the gradual relinquishment of the Emperor's Burgundian policy, and sees in his final retirement to Yuste in Estramadura, the fit climax of his changed views. "Out of all his wide dominions he found himself at home in Spain. The Flemish alien had become a Spaniard."

Despite Mr. Armstrong's contention that, in the end, Charles V. identified himself with the land of his mother, it seems pretty well agreed between him and Major Hume that the reign of Philip II. is the acme of distinctively Spanish greatness. At this point the authorship changes, and Major Hume writes once more on a subject with which his work at the Record Office has rendered him thoroughly familiar, and which he has already treated in more than one book. We have not discovered that he adds anything of consequence to what he has before written concerning the political leader of the Catholic Reaction. In 1897 he contributed a volume on Philip II. to the "Foreign Statesmen" series, and from this he draws copiously, both for his general propositions and for phrases or sentences. His conception of Philip is still the same—that of a narrow, unimaginative, conscientious man, who loved his country and worked hard for it, but managed to spoil every enterprise by formalism and the dependence of all generals or admirals on himself.

The main stages of Spanish decline under the later Hapsburgs are as well known as the protruding chins of those rulers. Major Hume has no difficulty in accounting for the facial distortion, but pays slight attention to the hidden causes of national ruin. Still, the proximate causes are clearly discernible in his picture of clerical aggression, royal imbecility, militarism, and the shameful rule of the "Lermas, the Olivares, and the Valenzuelas." Underneath the surface of court intrigue which purports to represent national government, he sees a "generous, soundhearted people," led wrong by an unfortunate historical development, rather than betrayed by its own sins. Major Hume's sympathy with the Spanish folk is strong, without at all blinding him to their racial and political shortcomings. Speaking of Olivares's attempt at the unification of institutions, he says:

"The policy itself, however ill-timed, was not in itself unwise, for the lack of unity between the provinces of Spain has produced a plentiful crop of troubles lasting to the present day. In short, Spanish pride wanted the glory of empire without paying for it. Olivares was no wiser than his contemporaries in economic science, and could only raise money by hampering industry which provided money. . . . It is lamentable and pathetic enough, but it is unjust to saddle the blame upon Olivares, who found the system already at work, and whose great sin was that he tried to insist upon all Spaniards making equal sacrifices to pay for the barren pride which all Spaniards shared."

We must express some surprise at a division of space which left Major Hume with only ten pages at his disposal for the reign of Charles III., the most honest and encouraging period in Spanish history since the sixteenth century. Not only does its length (1759-1788) entitle it to a fuller consideration than it receives, but the liberal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experiments then tried and their fair measure of success deserve an ample description. As Buckle long ago pointed out, Charles III. was the ablest ruler of his age with the exception of Frederick the Great, "whose vast abilities were tarnished by a base rapacity and by an incessant desire to overreach his neighbors." Major Hume also calls Charles "enlightened, generous, and just; sleepless in his vigilance for the good of his people," and he is appreciative of Floridablanca's vigorous régime. But we could have spared a good many pages from the account of Philip IV. and Charles II. for enlarged detail concerning Spain as she was between the Seven Years' War and the French Revolution.

Papias and his Contemporaries; A Study of Religious Thought in the Second Century. By Edward H. Hall. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1899.

This book has not the musty smell which we expect from books of critical theology, and nothing of that "sacred dulness" from which few distinguished critics besides Renan and Strauss have been exempt. It is actually pleasant reading. It is written as if for the instruction of people of good intelligence, yet not specialists, and it will convey more to such than the whole series of Harnack's 'History of Dogma,' which covers, so far as published, much the same ground. In the body of the book, the careful studies underlying it are assimilated to the literary form, but in the footnotes and the appendix we find Mr. Hall conversant with the whole range of original documents and critical discussions pertaining to his subject, and moving about among them with a quiet confidence that is not excessive, but well within the limits of the writer's exceptional understanding of his subject in all its parts and implications. For it must not be understood that we have here a product mainly depending for its value on the special application of the last six years, during which Mr. Hall has had no parochial charge. Twenty-five years ago he published a small book called 'Orthodoxy and Heresy.' Its purpose was to show that orthodoxy was a theological fiction, that there had never been any such thing, for the reason that there had been differences of opinion in the Christian church from the beginning, with no authoritative voice to decide upon their merits one way or the other. During the interim between that book and this, Mr. Hall has evidently brooded long on those conditions with which he had much concern in his former study, and hence the ripe and genial quality of the present one. There is something quintessential about it, as of a repeated distillation.

Mr. Hall's procedure reminds us of that of Kuenen in dealing with the Hexateuch. As Kuenen takes the eighth-century prophets and works back from their clear indications to the writings generally supposed to be anterior to them, so Mr. Hall takes the second-century Christian writers, and works out from them into the New Testament problems. He first consults Papias, the first writer after the death of Paul who presents any marked individuality. He interrogates him as to the New Testament writings, and finds that midway of the second century he knew nothing of those writings, but something of a "Matthew" which was not our "Matthew," and a "Mark" which was not our "Mark." Moreover, we find him valuing oral traditions of the Apostles' words much more highly than those written; and the average feeling of the century was of this kind. This is brought out very clearly in a second chapter, which considers such early writers as Clement and Ignatius and Polycarp and Barnabas, so-called, and with these the quite recently discovered 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' and 'Gospel of Peter.' From all these comes the same intimation—that, until far along towards the last quarter of the second century, our four Gospels had not been separated from other similar writings as of special value or authority. Chapter iii. is mainly devoted to "two learned doctors," Justin Martyr and Marcion. Mr. Hall's treatment of Justin has no trace of that acerbity which Justin's name has heretofore excited in so many pious hearts, whether of those believing or denying that his 'Memoirs of the Apostles' were our present Gospels. If they were, he took no pains to give the author's names, and Mr. Hall plainly inclines to the belief that they were other writings, and certainly that our fourth Gospel cannot be identified by one or two phrases of similar character, as if its characteristic doctrines had not been in the air. But, for the reason that Justin's 'Memoirs' were read regularly on Sundays, it is plain that the Old Testament writings were ceasing to be the only sacred scriptures, though which Christian writings, and which alone, would take a place beside them as of equal value, it would require another century, and longer, to decide.

Mr. Hall's discussion of Marcion and his writings, though perfectly judicial, has more of the warmth of advocacy than any other part of his book. Marcion cherished the Epistles of Paul as genuine Christian writings, and one Gospel, which may have been an earlier form of our present Luke—but he made no such claim for it, as he would gladly, it must seem, have done if he had had any excuse for doing so. Marcion was an early anti-Semite, denying the sacred character of the Hebrew scriptures and that Jehovah was the true God. He carried somewhat farther the un-Jewish sentiments of Paul, whom he admired so much. It is Renan's opinion that we are indebted to him for the preservation of Paul's letters. It is certain that learned doctors of his time took much offence at his enthusiasm for the Apostle to the Gentiles. Mr. Hall has other uses for Marcion in his next chapter, but at this stage the main one is to show how little knowledge he had of our New Testament as such. It is no part of Mr. Hall's business to exact for our Four Gospels later dates than are assigned to them by the somewhat reactionary criticism of Harnack and others. He would, however, suggest that the Synoptic Gospels, in order to go back to 70-80 A. D., must drop a good many of the *impedimenta* which they have been carrying since 200 A. D. or thereabouts. Those early Gospels were not exactly our Gospels, but something like them, and remained fluid for well nigh another century, undergoing constant diminution and addition.

"The progress of investigation may be said to have shown less and less token of deliberate or fraudulent manufacture of ancient records, and more and more evidence that the private or primitive documents out of which the New Testament sprang date back in some form close upon apostolic times. . . . The value of such a sketch as is here attempted, if value it have, lies not at all in weakening the foundations of a structure which, after all is said, must have its foundations in the distant past, but only in giving some notion of the early stages of its formation."

The effect, however, is not so confined as it is here represented as being. Obviously it includes the persuasion that the New Testament writings have no supernatural or peculiar sanctity. The action of Mr. Hall's method on the contrary persuasion is not that of the farmer with his pick and shovel breaking up the lingering drifts of winter's snow, but that of the spring winds that dissolve them in a more gentle but not less effectual manner.

"The Millennial Reign" is a chapter showing what good orthodoxy, as good as any, this doctrine was in the second century, when the survival of the soul apart from the resurrection of the body was accounted a most damnable heresy. The next following chapter extends the same criticism to the Gnostic speculations of the second century, and exhibits Paul's later Epistles as profoundly implicated in those speculations; as were similarly the speculations of the Fourth Gospel and the related Epistles. The concluding chapter, "The Mystic Gospel," is the most attractive presentation we have ever seen of a view that differs widely from that of the Christian apologist. "It will be impossible," says Mr. Hall, "to overrate its power or to be blind to the splendid assurance and sustained imaginative force with which it lifts the entire earthly scenery of Christianity into visionary spheres." Yet, "with the Fourth Gospel alone," we are assured, "we should never have guessed that Jesus of Nazareth led a human life, ending in a human tragedy." A note twelve pages long sums up in a very clear and convincing manner the whole modern discussion of the "Date of Authorship of the Fourth Gospel." Mr. Hall's position is that of Prof. Toy, viz., that, could the date of the Gospel be pushed back to the beginning of the second century, its critical significance would be much the same as if a later date were fixed. The Gospel would be no more historical with the earlier than with the later date.

Those who remember Dr. Holmes's description of Emerson as "an iconoclast without a hammer, who took down our idols from their pedestals so tenderly that it seemed like an act of worship," will think, perhaps, that another such is here. Mr. Hall's tenderness is unmistakable; his admiration, too, of many things which he cannot assign to their traditional places; likewise his human sympathy with forms of thought quite different from his own.

In the Australian Bush, and on the Coast of the Coral Sea. By Richard Semon. Macmillan Co. 1899. Roy. 8vo, xvi, 552 pp. Illustrated.

The author left Germany in 1891 with the intention of devoting two years to the study of the vertebrate Australian fauna, especially the development of the oviparous mammals and marsupials, and of *Neoceratodus,* a remarkable Australian fish. In pursuance of these objects he spent a good deal of time in Queensland, Northeast Australia, besides visiting the district of Thursday Island, Torres Strait; the south coast of British New Guinea; Celebes and other islands between Papua and Borneo, in the group of the Moluccas; Java, Banda, and Singapore.

Neoceratodus, commonly known to Australian settlers as the "Burnett salmon"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and sometimes called the "lungfish," is a large animal, representing a type more or less intermediate between amphibians and fishes, with many archaic characters; the fins are limblike, the tail pointed instead of forked, and its supposed nearest relatives occur as fossils. At the time of Dr. Semon's expedition, nothing whatever had been recorded in regard to the development of this animal, the study of which was expected to throw much light on the evolutionary history of fishes. The embryology of the duck-billed *Platypus* or *Ornithorynchus* was also at that time entirely unstudied, and but little was known in regard to the younger stages of the Australian marsupials. The field which he explored was therefore one of rich promise, and offered to the successful investigator exceptionally important scientific results.

The geographical distribution of the living *Neoceratodus* is limited to the upper waters of two Queensland rivers, the Mary and the Burnett; it obtained its name of "salmon," not from any external resemblance to a salmon, but because its flesh is of a reddish color. It is an uncommonly indolent creature, a general feeder, which will occasionally take the hook, but is usually caught by the Australian natives in small hand-nets. It cannot progress when out of the water, and, according to our author, does not, like its African relative *Protopterus*, bury itself in the mud in times of drought in a kind of hibernation. Although it has in addition to its gills a sort of lung by which it can breathe air, it does not appear to be able to exist entirely without water; the most that Dr. Semon will admit in this direction is that, when severe droughts reduce a stream to a series of fetid mud-holes and slimy pools, the lungfish is able to survive when the other aquatic animals succumb. The spawn is gelatinous and very delicate, requiring the greatest care to keep it alive for study.

Dr. Semon, with some white assistants and a number of natives, camped in the vicinity of the Burnett for some months, and, after much trouble, succeeded in obtaining and preserving a series of the eggs in various stages. The hours of waiting were improved by collections of the birds and mammals, especially the young stages of *Echidna*, and several marsupials. His study of the eggs of *Neoceratodus* showed that the development is much more like that of amphibians than that of any other known fish; thus confirming the theory of its intermediate character which had been based on the anatomical characters of the full-grown animal.

The account of Dr. Semon's labors and travels is destitute of any very startling adventures. He describes in a pleasant way his daily occupations, the scenic characteristics of the regions visited, and the impression made upon him by their native inhabitants. He formed a somewhat higher opinion of the Australian blacks than that usually expressed by travellers. The relation of his experiences on the coast of New Guinea is perhaps the most entertaining part of the book, as touching a region much less known to the layman than the other districts visited. The chief and in fact almost the only criticism which suggests itself is, that the author has dwelt somewhat too long on unimportant and personal matters, and thus increased the size and cost of his book as well as diluted its interest.

The illustrations are excellent, the maps good, there is a sufficient index, and for those interested in and not yet familiar with the literature of the Malay-Australian region the work can be cordially recommended. It may be added that the translation of this work from the German original was made under the author's supervision, and that the technical scientific results of the expedition are being separately published under the title of 'Zoölogische Forschungsreisen in Australien und dem Malayischen Archipel.'

The Land Registration Act of Massachusetts, which took effect October 1, 1898. With an introductory statement, annotations, cross-references, and citations of cases bearing upon it. By Charles S. Rackemann. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1898.

Mr. Rackemann has rendered, in this little book, a considerable practical service to his profession and the public. He has not only published an annotated edition of the new Massachusetts Torrens law, but has put his finger upon the weak spot in the statute, and indicated concisely but clearly the constitutional question which will have to be met before the system can supplant that now in existence. The passage of the Torrens law in Massachusetts has already brought this question into the courts, and, while it is still *sub judice*, we are not inclined to express an opinion one way or the other; but the point involved is worth attention, as, should the statute be declared unconstitutional, it would seem as if a very serious difficulty had been encountered by those who are endeavoring to establish the Torrens system in this country.

The system is in essence one of title insurance by the State. Its object is to make the transfer of land as simple as that of personal property, by making titles incontestable. It differs in several respects from the present system of private title-insurance, which in the last twenty years has established itself in all the chief cities of the United States. The latter system insures the purchaser against eviction, just as fire insurance insures him against fire. He pays a small premium, and, if evicted by superior title, he recovers a sum of money which makes his loss good. But eviction cannot be prevented. Under the Torrens system, eviction is wholly impossible, and the insurance money goes not to the purchaser, but to any one having a superior title who may suffer from not being able to evict him. All titles once obtained from the State (for under the Torrens system the State is the issuer of the title) become non-contestable.

The objection made by Mr. Rackemann—and this we understand to be the sum and substance of the suit now pending in the Massachusetts Supreme Court—is that, under our constitutional system, this is impracticable, substantially because a Torrens law decree that the title of A. B. is valid and non-contestable, involves the summary adjudication of a question between A. B. and the whole world, and that our constitutions make no provision for such an adjudication by any summary process. A. B. comes into a Torrens court and demands a certificate of title for a piece of land bounded by land of persons unknown. The scheme of the act is that the court shall call on all concerned to come into court and prove any adverse claim or else for ever hold their peace. But the objectors say that such a method of barring claimants to land is neither equity nor common law; that there can be no proper trial either *inter partes* or *in rem;* that it is not "due process of law," but deprives persons of their property otherwise than in accordance with "the law of the land." It is a nice point, and we do not profess to prophesy what view the Supreme Court of Massachusetts will take of it. Mr. Rackemann's book has been the signal for a battle royal over it, and all those who, like ourselves, heartily approve the principle of the Torrens system, will be glad to have the question of constitutionality (we have only mentioned the point principally involved) considered and disposed of by a court of last resort of high standing. The volume includes a Torrens System bibliography of nearly fifty titles.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Abrojal, Tulis. An Index Finger. R. F. Fenno & Co. $1.25.
Arnold's "Sweetness and Light" and Pater's "Essay on Style." Macmillan. 75c.
Atherton, Gertrude. A Daughter of the Vine. John Lane. $1.50.
Audry, Mrs. W. Early Chapters in Science. London: Murray; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $2.
Baylor, Frances C. The Ladder of Fortune. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Bernhardt, Wilhelm. Frommel's Eingeschneit. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 30c.
Bildt, Baron de. Christine de Suède et Cardinal Azzolino. Lettres Inédites (1666-1668). Paris: Plon, Nourrit & Cie.
Cambridge Compositions. Greek and Latin. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan.
Cobb, Thomas. Carpet Courtship. John Lane. $1.
Cohn, Prof. A., and Sanderson, Prof. R. Lesage's Gil Blas. Abbreviated. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 40c.
Copeland, C. T. Letters of Thomas Carlyle to his Youngest Sister. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2.
Davidson, John. Godfrida. A Play in Four Acts. John Lane.
De Quincey, Thomas. The Confessions of an English Opium-Eater. [Temple Classics.] London: Dent; New York: Macmillan.
Doyle, A. C. A Duet, with an Occasional Chorus. Appletons.
Doyle, Dr. C. W. The Taming of the Jungle. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $1.
Dudeney, Mrs. Henry. The Maternity of Harriott Wicken. Macmillan. $1.50.
Eleutheropoulos, A. Die Sittlichkeit; oder, Der philosophische Sittlichkeitswahn. Berlin: E. Hofmann; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Farquhar, Anna. The Professor's Daughter. Doubleday & McClure Co.
Fiske, John. Through Nature to God. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.
Ford, J. D. M. Goldoni's Un Curioso Accidente. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 25c.
Gross, S. E. The Merchant Prince of Cornville. A Comedy. Rand, McNally & Co. 75c.
Grosvenor, Prof. E. A. Duruy's Ancient History of the East. T. Y. Crowell & Co. $1.
Grosvenor, Prof. E. A. Contemporary History of the World. T. Y. Crowell & Co. $1.
Hale, E. E. James Russell Lowell and his Friends. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $3.
Harrison, Mrs. Burton. A Triple Entanglement. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
Hatfield, Prof. J. T. Goethe's Hermann and Dorothea. Macmillan. 60c.
Herbart, Prof. J. F. Letters and Lectures on Education. London: Sonnenschein; Syracuse, N. Y.: C. W. Bardeen.
Hewlett, Maurice. Pan and the Young Shepherd. A Pastoral in Two Acts. John Lane. $1.25.
Hill, G. B. Unpublished Letters of Dean Swift. F. A. Stokes Co. $3.50.
Huntington, Rev. W. R. The Church-Idea. An Essay towards Unity. 4th ed. Scribners. 50c.
Hutchinson, W. B., and Criswell, J. A. E. Patents and How to Make Money out of Them. Fidelity Publishing Co. $1.25.
Hyde, Douglas. A Literary History of Ireland. Scribners. $4.
Jackman, W. S. Nature Study for Grammar Grades. Macmillan. $1.
Jepson, Edgar, and Beames, Capt. D. On the Edge of the Empire. $1.50.
Keen, W. W. The Bi-Centennial Celebration of the Founding of the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Baptist Publication Society. $3.
Kerr, Prof. Alexander. The Bacchæ of Euripides. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.05.
Koeppel, Emil. Tennyson. [Geisteshelden Biographien.] Berlin: Ernst Hofmann; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Kuhns, Prof. Oscar. Rostand's Cyrano de Bergerac. Henry Holt & Co. 80c.
Lanier, Sidney. Retrospects and Prospects. Descriptive and Historical Essays. Scribners. $1.50.
Laughlin, E. O. Johnnie. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co.
Loomis, C. B. Just Rhymes. Illustrated. R. H. Russell.
Lust, Adelina C. A Tent of Grace. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Maeterlinck, Maurice. Three Little Dramas for Marionettes. Chicago: C. H. Sergel Co. $1.25.
Marot, Helen. A Handbook of Labor Literature. Philadelphia: Free Library of Economics. $1.
McManus, Blanche. The Quaker Colony. [Colonial Monographs.] E. R. Herrick & Co.
Memoirs of Sergeant Bourgogne, 1812-1813. Doubleday & McClure Co. $1.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Miller, William. Travels and Politics in the Near East. F. A. Stokes Co. $5.
Milton, John. Complete Poetical Works. [Cambridge Edition.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2.
Morris, Charles. Our Island Empire. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $1.25.
Palgrave, Gwenllian F. Francis Turner Palgrave: his Journals, and Memories of his Life. Longmans, Green & Co. $3.50.
Poems of Henry Timrod. Memorial edition. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Prescott, E. L. The Measure of a Man. R. F. Fenno & Co. $1.25.
Robertson, J. F. Creep afore ye Gang. New York: J. B. Cowdin.
Rodman, W. A. Fate or Law. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.
Rosny, J. H. L'Alguille d'Or. Paris: Colin & Cie.
Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám. [Golden Treasury Series.] Macmillan. $1.
Sargent, F. L. Corn Plants. Their Uses and Ways of Life. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 75c.
Smith, Dr. D. T. The Philosophy of Memory, and Other Essays. Louisville: J. P. Morton & Co. $1.25.
Smith, Z. F., and Clay, Mrs. Mary R. The Clay Family. [Filson Club Publications.] Louisville: J. P. Morton & Co.
Smylie, Maj. C. A. Points in Minor Tactics. 2d ed. Appletons.
Stead, W. T. The United States of Europe. Doubleday & McClure Co. $2.
Stevens, Prof. G. B. The Theology of the New Testament. Scribners. $2.50.
Stone, Rev. R. A. In Africa's Forest and Jungle; or, Six Years among the Yorubans. F. H. Revell Co. $1.
Stratemeyer, Edward. Fighting in Cuban Waters. [Old Glory Series.] Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.25.
Thayer, W. R. Throne-Makers. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
The Gambling World. Dodd, Mead & Co. $3.50.
The Living Age. Jan.-March, 1899. Boston: Living Age Co.
Vance, Wilson. God's War. F. T. Neely.
Van Dyke, Rev. Henry. The Gospel for a World of Sin. Macmillan. $1.25.
Verhaeren, Emile. The Dawn. Chicago: C. H. Sergel Co. $1.25.
Warden, Florence. Joan, the Curate. F. M. Buckles & Co. $1.
Whiteing, Richard. No. 5 John Street. Century Co. $1.50.
Wilkinson, Spenser. From Cromwell to Wellington. Twelve Soldiers. London: Lawrence & Bullen; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
Williams, J. L. The Stolen Story, and Other Newspaper Stories. Scribners. $1.25.
Woodberry, Prof. G. E. Heart of Man. Macmillan. $1.50.

Henry Holt & Co.

29 West 23d St., New York. **378 Wabash Ave., Chicago** (*for text-books only*)

HAVE RECENTLY PUBLISHED:

FRENCH.

Canfield's French Lyrics. Selected and edited by Prof. A. G. CANFIELD of the University of Kansas. xxiv + 382 pp. 16mo. $1 00, *net.*

Over 230 poems from some 50 poets, with a luminous sketch of the growth of the French lyric; an analysis of French versification and notes by the editor.

Rostand's Cyrano de Bergerac. Edited by Prof. OSCAR KUHNS of Wesleyan (Ct.) xi + 202 pp. 12mo. 80c. net.

Méras & Stern's First Lessons in FRENCH. By Prof. B. MÉRAS and Director S. M. STERN of Stern's School of Languages, New York. 321 pp. 12mo. $1.00, *net.*

Méras & Stern's Grammaire Fran- ÇAISE. The method of this book is quite unusual. 312 pp. 12mo. $1.25 *net.*

Segur: Le Retrait de Moscou. Edited by Prof. O. B. SUPER of Dickinson. viii+135 pp. 16mo. Boards. 35c. *net.*

Musset's Histoire d'Un Merle Blanc Edited by Misses WILLIAMS and COINTAT of Smith. iv+50 pp. 16mo. Bds. 30c., *net.*

Hugo: Scènes de Voyage. De Paris à Aix-la-Chapelle. Selections from *Le Rhin.* Edited by T. B. BRONSON. xvi+277 pp. 16mo. 85c., *net.*

Toepffer's Bibliothèque de Mon ONCLE. Edited by ROBERT L. TAYLOR, of Yale. xx + 201 pp. 50c. *net.*

IN PRESS:

Kuhns's French Reader for Begin- NERS. By Prof. OSCAR KUHNS of Wesleyan (Ct.)

CHEMISTRY.

Congdon's Qualitative Analysis. By Prof. ERNEST A. CONGDON of Drexel Institute. 64 pp. Interleaved. 8vo, 60c., *net.*

Ready in May.

Torrey's Elementary Studies in CHEMISTRY. By Dr. JOSEPH TORREY, Jr., of Harvard. About 400 pp.

Woodhull's Chemical Experiments. By Prof. JOHN F. WOODHULL, author of "A First Course in Science." 12mo.

GERMAN.

Lessing's Minna von Barnhelm. Edited by A. B. NICHOLS of Harvard, and a portrait and reproductions of twelve etchings by CHODOWIECKI. xxxvi+163 pp. 16mo. Cloth, 60c., *net.*

Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. With Introduction, Notes, and a FULL VOCABULARY by Prof. A. H. PALMER of Yale. *Illustrated with views, reproductions of documents, etc.* lxxvi+404 pp. 16mo. Cloth, 80c., *net.* (*Without vocabulary* 60c. *net.*)

Stern's First Lessons in German. By SIGMON M. STERN, director of Stern's School of Languages, New York. 292 pp. 12mo, $1 *net.*

Rosegger's die Schriften des Wald- SCHULMEISTERS. An authorized abridgment. Edited by Prof. LAWRENCE FOSSLER of the University of Nebraska. With two poems by Baumbach and frontispiece. xii + 158 pp. Bds. 40c., *net.*

Leander's Traeumereien. Ten of the best of these stories. Edited, with notes and vocabulary, by Miss I. B. WATSON of the Hartford (Conn.) High School. 151 pp. 12mo. Bds. 40c. *net.*

Stern's Aus Deutschen Meister- WERKEN. *Niebelungen, Parcival* (und Lohengrin), *Gudrun, Tristan und Isolde.* Erzählt von SIGMON M. STERN. WITH A FULL VOCABULARY. xxvii+225 pp. 16mo. $1.20 *net.*

Corwin's German and English Ex- ERCISES for supplementary use with Whitney's Compendious German Grammar and Whitney's Brief German Grammar. With notes and vocabularies. By Prof. R. N. CORWIN of Yale. 77 pp. 12mo. Paper, 25c., *net.*

The prices of the two Whitney Grammars are $1.30 *net* and 60c., *net*, respectively.

Watson's German Sight Reading. With notes by Miss I. B. WATSON of the Hartford (Conn.) High School. 41 pp. 16mo. Bds. 40c., *net.* Good passages of easy, unhackneyed prose.

MATHEMATICS.

Evans's Algebra for Schools. By GEORGE W. EVANS, Instructor in the English High School, Boston. 438 pp. 12mo, $1.12, *net.*

A fresh and enthusiastic presentation of the subject; it makes the student think of his algebra problems as related to life.

Nipher's Introduction to Graphic ALGEBRA. For High Schools. By Prof. F. E. NIPHER of Washington University. 61 pp. 12mo, 60c, *net.*

*** *Postage on* NET *books 8 per cent. additional.*

TRANSLATIONS AND REPRINTS.

JUST PUBLISHED.

Vol. V. No. 2. Protests of the Cour des Aides of Paris, April 10, 1775.

French Text, English Translation, 162 pages. By J. H. ROBINSON, Ph.D., Columbia University. Paper, 60c.; Cloth, 80c.

Circulars on application. D. C. MUNRO, Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philada., Pa.

To Authors: Manuscripts required. **We Publish** A new book every day in the year.
TENNYSON NEELY, Publisher, FIFTH AVE. NEW YORK

NEW ORDER. CHICAGO, ILL. A 16-page critical monthly. Rev. Phebe Hanaford says: "its reading matter is interesting and valuable, literary tone excellent; keeps abreast of the times." Per year, with premium, 25 cents. 6 months, 10 cents.

Oliver Cromwell

COMMEMORATION EDITION.

A History. Comprising a Narrative of his Life, with Extracts from his Letters and Speeches, and an Account of the Political, Religious, and Military Affairs of England during his Time. By SAMUEL HARDEN CHURCH, Litt.D., A.M.

With 18 photogravure illustrations, and battle plans of Marston Moor and Naseby. Royal 8°, size 6½x9½, gilt top, uncut edges, pp. xvii.+542, $6.00, *net.*

What, however, we confess interests one most in the volume is the excellent account furnished by Mr. Church of the military side of Cromwell's career. He appears to have neglected no means by which to arrive at the most complete and accurate account of the various conflicts of the prolonged Parliamentary War. We doubt whether a better description on the whole of the leading battles of the civil war has ever been furnished than in this work.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK & LONDON.

JUST PUBLISHED.

A new novel by GERTRUDE ATHERTON.

A Daughter of the Vine.

Uniform with "Patience Sparhawk and Her Times" and the "Californians."

With Portrait of the Author.

JOHN LANE, 140 Fifth Ave., N.Y.

OXFORD MAPS.
By Prof. H. S. OSBORN, LL.D.

PALESTINE,
WESTERN ASIA,
EGYPT AND SINAI,
ST. PAUL'S TRAVELS.

These maps cover all Biblical Geography, contain all recent discoveries, and are accepted authority. Can be seen over large rooms. Special terms for the maps as a set.

Oxford Map Publishers, Oxford, Ohio.

Modern French Literature.

By BENJAMIN W. WELLS, Ph.D., Harvard.

12mo, Cloth, $1.50.

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers,
254 Washington St., Boston.

AUTHORS For all business between Author and Publisher, address EDITORIAL BUREAU, 120 Liberty St., New York. Mention *Nation.*

AUTOGRAPH LETTERS of Famous People bought and sold by WALTER R. BENJAMIN, 1125 Broadway, New York City. Send for price-list.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED